

adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 25, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 24, 1964:

Santos Buxo, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Puerto Rico for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 9, 1964.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 128: 1: Blessed is everyone that feareth the Lord; that walketh in His ways.

O Thou God of all majesty and holiness, inspire us during this moment of prayer with a reassuring sense of Thyself for Thou art a presence to strengthen and sustain us, a light to guide and direct, a sympathy to comfort and cheer, a love that will never fail or let us go.

May we become more fully aware of the sanctity of our tasks and responsibilities and may we be courageous in meeting the demands and decisions which challenge the best and noblest that is within us of mind and heart.

Grant that in these perilous times when our national and international problems seem so complex and difficult, our President, our Speaker, and our chosen representatives may see clearly that as finite and fallible human beings we were never expected or meant to meet those problems unaided and alone for Thou hast made available and placed at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace.

Hear our prayer in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6041. An act to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; and

H.R. 9740. An act to establish the Roosevelt Campobello International Park, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4364. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use

of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10433. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10532. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MONROE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. CASE, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the bill (H.R. 221) entitled "An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from an injury or disease arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments numbered 3 and 4 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 502. An act to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam; and

S. 2370. An act authorizing maintenance of flood and arroyo sediment control dams and related works to facilitate Rio Grande canalization project and authorizing appropriations for that purpose.

TO PERMIT THE VESSEL "SC-1473" TO ENGAGE IN THE FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of making an announcement with respect to the program.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the House that on tomorrow the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has advised that he will ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (H.R. 6007) to permit the vessel SC-1473 to engage in the fisheries.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

June 23, 1964.

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 10456) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes," together with all accompanying papers.

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate is agreed to.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1965

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Thursday, June 25, 1964, to file a privileged report on the foreign assistance and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

GRANT TO PURDUE UNIVERSITY

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, Purdue University in Lafayette, Ind., has been named by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as the recipient of a grant of \$840,000 to finance construction of additional laboratory and rocket-firing facilities at its jet propulsion center.

The jet propulsion center at this great Midwestern university has been engaged in aerospace research for the past 17 years. It has pioneered in solving problems related to liquid bipropellant rocket motors operated at high combustion

pressures. The current activities of this center include investigation in a broad area of aerospace propulsion.

I consider this another step toward the realization of the potential the Midwest has to offer in space age development activities. This goal, the full realization of Midwest potential, has been and will continue to be one of my personal goals.

We have made gains toward this goal but there is still a long distance to go. Two years ago I played a part in the establishment at Indiana University of the Center for Industrial Application for Space Technology. It is designed to make available to industry the vast amount of knowledge gained in space research, knowledge which has industrial applications in other fields besides that of space.

This was a pilot project for the United States. Its value is attested by the fact that two other centers are being established at Wayne State University in Detroit and at the University of Maryland. Another is authorized for the University of Pittsburgh and still another is under consideration for the University of North Carolina.

My efforts to obtain for Indiana and the Midwest a just share of Government-financed activities have been called parochial by some. I might add these criticisms are not from Indiana or the Midwest. I challenge that criticism. Our Nation cannot afford not to use every tool and resource at its disposal. It has not been doing so in Indiana and the Midwest. It is starting to do so. I am certain the steps that have been taken are only the first of many which will provide new job opportunities, stimulate business growth, and add to the economic health of my section of the Nation.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON APPORTIONMENT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 23 I introduced House Joint Resolution 1050 proposing an amendment to the Constitution to read as follows:

The judicial powers of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity for the apportionment or method of apportionment of representation in a State legislature or either house thereof, nor for the composition of any legislative or administrative body in any political subdivision of a State.

The Congress has a duty to submit an amendment for ratification by the States without undue delay, in order to save our form of Government.

The Supreme Court of the United States was never vested with power to dictate the governmental structure of any State in the Union, and its present-day assertion of such power is manifest error on its part. The Court must be led

out of the political thicket into which it has strayed. The Congress must initiate this important and fundamental action.

Once before in our history, soon after the adoption of the Constitution, it was necessary to limit the judicial power in order to save the Federal character of our system. The result then was the 11th amendment, and the proposal I have introduced follows that amendment in form.

It is pertinent to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal judiciary was not conceived to be an instrument of political power. Here is a branch of Government not chosen by the people, nor at any time answerable to them. Federal judges are appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for good behavior, which is life. They can be removed by impeachment only for treason, bribery or other high crime or misdemeanor. It is a fact of history, supported by a fair reading of the Constitution, that political power in our system was designed to be vested in the people and their elected representatives. Federal judges are not those representatives. The resolution of political questions is not their prerogative, nor in their rightful power.

THE BOBBY BAKER INVESTIGATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, disclosure yesterday that State's Attorney Arthur A. Marshall, of Prince Georges County, Md., has made public a call girl's list of names, allegedly including past and present Members of Congress, again brings into focus the Bobby Baker investigation.

On this list, and previously mentioned in connection with the Baker scandals, is the name of Joseph Fabianich, alias Joe Fabian, now serving a 9-year Federal prison sentence for operating a call-girl ring in the Washington area.

This is the same Fabianich who was recently and suddenly spirited out of a nearby lockup to the more inaccessible Fort Leavenworth prison. This also recalls the speedy action with which Elly Rometsch, the German call girl, was deported from this country when the Baker scandals broke last fall.

It is time for Congress to drag this mess from under the rug, and let the chips fall wherever they may.

BRITISH FIRMS INDICATE HESITANCY TO SELL TO CASTRO'S CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the recent news of the sale of British

buses to Cuba serves as a good indication that Great Britain has little intention of cooperating with U.S. policies to halt free world trade with Castro and strangle his economy. Not only does the British Government persist in allowing British manufacturers to sell to eager and hungry Castro, but it continues to allow British ships to relieve the Russian supply burden by hauling cargo to Cuba.

The Leyland Motors' recent deal to sell Castro buses was accompanied by a rather unusual report that Leyland Motors would not see the deal through if so asked by the British Government.

It would be easy for the British Government to halt this particular sale, and many others like it, as most of the British firms trading with Castro avail themselves of the "payment insurance" provided by the Government's Exports Credit Guarantee Department. The only step necessary would be to curb export guarantees for Cuban shipments. No other action need be taken, as most of Britain's major banking houses are leery of financing sales to Castro because he is already an estimated \$238 million behind in deficits coming from his need to import more than he can produce.

Despite his difficulties, Castro's trade with Great Britain is on the rise, with Castro having bought \$8.4 million in goods from Britain during the first 4 months of this year, as compared to some \$2.8 million for the same period last year.

Mr. Speaker, Castro's economy is suffering, and his only hope is to continue to trade with the free world as the Communist bloc alone cannot keep him supplied. Britain could do much to hasten Castro's end by halting its trade with him. It could start with stopping the Leyland bus deal.

WHITE HOUSE JET FLEET

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to wonder aloud about the high cost of maintaining the jet fleet for the convenience of the President of the United States and his official family when they travel about the country on official or semiofficial business. Everyone in the House knows that the President has a number of jets assigned to the White House and no one usually questions their number and the cost of maintaining them. Everyone wants the President of the United States and his family to have the best that the taxpayers of the Nation can buy. I am not questioning this today. However, I am wondering aloud if the taxpayers—some of whom are not of the President's political faith—are paying the cost of transporting the President and the members of his official family in these jets to political functions—particularly to political fundraising functions such as the \$100 a plate Democrat dinner the President will be attending in Detroit on June 26. Cer-

tainly the taxpayers should not be asked to pay the cost of this trip when the already full and overflowing treasuries of the various Democrat committees will be enriched by thousands upon thousands of dollars due solely to the President's appearance at this affair.

I think it is incumbent upon the "free press" to keep the Nation informed on such matters and I will be waiting to read the stories revealing payment by the Democrat committee for this Detroit and similar trips during this campaign year.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate while the House is in session this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 165]

Ashbrook	Harding	Rogers, Tex.
Avery	Healey	Roosevelt
Baring	Hoffman	Schadeberg
Bass	Ichord	Scott
Bennett, Mich.	Kee	Senner
Bolling	Kilburn	Sisk
Bow	Kilgore	Springer
Bruce	King, Calif.	Staggers
Buckley	Lankford	Steed
Cameron	Long, La.	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Tenn.	Miller, N.Y.	Toll
Diggs	Morton	Tupper
Dingell	Pilcher	Tuten
Evins	Pool	Willis
Forrester	Powell	Wylder
Green, Oreg.	Randall	
Hall	Reid, N.Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 732 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3881) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation

systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. After the passage of the bill H.R. 3881, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 6 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 3881 as passed by the House.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 732 provides for the consideration of H.R. 3881, a bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas.

The resolution provides for an open rule with 4 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill and all points of order are waived on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no legislation that will be before this Congress this year that is as important as this legislation, particularly if the Members, as I do, come from a metropolitan area.

This is an opportunity for us to clean up our antiquated transit systems that have been in existence since long before the beginning of the century. This is an opportunity for us to be able to move those elevated structures that we have in the old cities of America. This is an opportunity to clear up blighted areas. This is an opportunity to revitalize very important property, the beautiful property that has gone into blight in the major cities of this Nation.

During the course of the years we have spent in this Congress over \$50 billion on road programs, yet we have spent nothing whatsoever as far as trying to pass a mass transportation bill concerning our local elevated or railroad systems.

H.R. 3881 is the administration's mass transit bill which provides partial Federal grants to improve bus service, commuter rail lines, and other mass transit systems in and around our towns and cities. The Congress has been strongly urged to act on this measure by both the late President John F. Kennedy and by

President Lyndon Johnson. There are six major features of the committee bill.

First. Federal grants would be authorized for up to two-thirds of that part of the cost of facilities and equipment that cannot be financed by revenues alone. Local grants in cash would be required for the other one-third. This is the same formula used under the urban renewal program. Revenues from the transit system would pay for needed new investment to the extent possible, but the margin of total cost which cannot be financed this way would be covered by these Federal and local grants.

Second. To assure that the Federal assistance will accomplish the objectives of the bill, strict planning requirements are provided for, including the preparation of an areawide transportation plan as a part of comprehensive planning for the development of the urban area. The bill also recognizes the urgency of this problem and the heavy cost of delay in a further provision that for a 3-year period the grants could be made on an emergency basis but with reduced Federal participation. These grants would be for only one-half of the net project cost, but the additional one-sixth Federal grant would be available if full planning requirements are met within 3 years of the date of the grant agreement.

Third. The bill authorizes appropriation of \$500 million in Federal grant funds over a 3-year period—\$100 million in the first year and \$200 million in each of the succeeding fiscal years. Because of the long leadtime in programs of this kind, the budget impact in the first year that funds are appropriated is estimated at only \$10 million. The bill also would restore the unused balance of the \$50 million loan authority provided by the Housing Act of 1961. Approximately \$47 million remains of this authority.

Fourth. The bill would continue and, in fact, improve the effort to find new and better ways to meet our mass transit needs by providing that \$10 million of each of the 3 fiscal year installments can be used for research, development, and demonstration grants replacing the present limited demonstration program created in 1961.

Fifth. An adequate relocation program would be required for families displaced by assisted projects. Federal grants for relocation payments to families, individuals, and business concerns would be authorized similar to those in effect under the urban renewal program.

Sixth. The committee bill also includes provisions to protect the rights of employees of local transit systems affected by the program.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that unless legislation of this type is passed by this Congress there is no possibility that we can improve the antiquated systems that we have in the metropolitan areas at the present time. I know in the local area I represent, I know of no bill more important to the district than the present bill that we have up for consideration today. We have a downtown area in the city of Boston where we have a viaduct that was built in the 1890's right through

the most valuable property in the city of Boston. This is an opportunity with the aid of the Federal Government to tear down such a structure, to relocate the transport lines and to beautify the city. Such legislation would bring a tremendous revaluation of city property. We cannot possibly do this all alone, if our local transportation system runs a deficit, if we in the cities and towns through real estate taxes must make this up. We need Federal assistance not only in Boston. Every major city in the United States needs Federal assistance, and this is a bill that will do the job.

Over the years we have spent over \$50 billion on our road program, for what purpose? Building overpasses over these viaducts, building underpasses under these viaducts. We have wasted more money building cloverleaves and things of that nature than we would need to take care of the mass transportation bill, which, in my opinion, is going to amount to billions in the course of years and will amount to more and more and more if we do not start it now.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the rule is adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why in all conscience have points of order been waived on a bill of this nature?

Mr. O'NEILL. I presume there is legislation in the bill that is subject to points of order or the committee would not have asked for that provision. The gentleman will have to ask the gentleman from the Committee on Banking and Currency about that, as to why he asked for it.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman state why points of order were waived? I will ask the gentleman from Texas. His name appears on the report. I would prefer that he answer it.

Mr. PATMAN. There is a traditional phrase used when these things come up.

Mr. O'NEILL. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. That is not much of an answer, I may say.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 3881, as amended by committee amendment, has been kicking around in the House of Representatives since February of 1863-1863. Well, it is about that old, about 100 years old, the idea that somehow you can get someone else to pick up the check for that which you should do yourself. In any event, this measure has been before Congress in one form or another for a long time.

As to what this bill actually provides, and we might as well be frank and honest about it and understand the situation, is to permit the camel to get his nose under the tent, to spend \$500 million in the next 2 or 3 years, primarily in deciding what rundown, ramshackle property can be foisted off on the Federal

taxpayers by communities, or by transportation systems, or by private owners, that has proven a failure under the present conditions.

I was not surprised when my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Rules Committee, for whom I have great affection, frankly stated he was in support of this bill, because it would be of especial benefit to his own home community, to his own home State, for he told us the transportation system in his own city was antiquated, was worn out, was not now operating on a sound financial basis.

Of course, knowing as most of us do, and I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts will agree, that Boston has a splendid municipal government, it is hard to understand how anyone can believe that if a sound, economical government, such as exists in the city of Boston, or any other large city, cannot operate the transportation system it presently owns on an economic basis, on a sound financial basis, the Federal Government can come in and do so.

Of course, the real idea behind this bill is that the Federal Government, if it takes over or loans the money for the community to take over transportation facilities, in the end, whatever the loss may be in the operation of such facility, Uncle Sam, which means you and I and all the taxpayers in our districts, who will not be benefited by this legislation, will be picking up the tab and paying the cost thereof.

I know it sounds well, and perhaps it is a bit of a dream, or perhaps a bit of an ideal to talk about running a subway from Portland, Maine, down to Miami, Fla., or something of that sort, or extending subways, or renovating them, or making new commuter train services pay when private ownership has been unable to make such systems pay.

But I have news for some of you folks, and that is that they invented a few years ago a thing called an automobile, and you are not going to get people to ride a subway or a commuter train if they can drive an automobile in decent weather. It does not make much difference how much money is spent, or how much is siphoned out of the Federal Treasury, it is on borrowed money and this whole program will be financed, if it is started—on borrowed money for your great-grandchildren yet unborn to pay. In spite of the great prosperity we are enjoying today, the greatest in the economic history of any country, we are still engaging in deficit financing and are still going out and borrowing money, and adding to our national debt, just as we did when we again lifted the debt ceiling just Thursday of last week, so as to continue to borrow money at a time when we are more prosperous than we have ever been in all history. To do what? To finance new expensive spending programs such as this.

This program may be good. Perhaps someone can convince everyone that it is a proper thing to do and perhaps not. I doubt it, for I think it will be difficult to convince the average-thinking American that it is a good thing to do this on borrowed money.

If we had a balanced budget, and if we were meeting our operating expenses of Government, and if we had a surplus, it would be one thing to talk about this new program. But when you are putting a new program like this on top of all the other big spending programs, and when we were going further into debt, and three times in the last calendar year alone we increased the national debt limit, so the Government can borrow more and more money to pay for these costly experiments in state socialism, that is a different thing.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman made a remark about the city of Boston. The mayor of the city of Boston is considered by all to be one of the outstanding mayors in the United States and last week he received an honorary degree from Harvard University. He was the first mayor to receive such an honorary degree in over 60 years.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. O'NEILL. The transportation we have in our areas is under the jurisdiction of a quasi-public authority and has nothing to do with the city of Boston. All the cities and towns in the area pay the expenses and make up the deficit in the cost of operation. What I had in mind was this. That through the Nation these small feeder lines that feed into the mass transportation systems in the metropolitan areas are folding up and failing every day. Unless we do something for these small companies that feed into the mass transportation lines, you are going to pay for roads just as you have paid over \$50 billion in the last 10 or 12 years, and you are going to have to pay billions and billions of dollars more. Now is the time to stop this tremendous expense that we would have on roads and we could do it by starting a program of mass transportation and public utility systems.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Do I understand that the gentleman is against the Federal highway program? I did not expect that.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman knows me better than that. But think of the savings we can bring about as I have explained by avoiding the expense of building viaducts over highways and underpasses beneath the viaducts. We have wasted a great amount of money doing that and all these cities could save that money.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I regret that I cannot yield further to my colleague as I am short of time now. But I am glad to have my good friend join the economy bloc. We embrace you; for we love you. We respect you very much.

I should like to call your attention to the fact that I did not say anything critical of your organization or officials in your home city or home State. Instead I praised them.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot yield further at this time. I praised them.

I wish to say, again, this is just the camel's nose under the tent. The actual cost will be at least \$20 billion to \$40 billion, judging from all the testimony we received, and this will not even scratch the surface.

Of course, a lot of people in this country would like to sell their rundown property to the Federal Government, or to some municipality, or to some agency of government, whatever it might be—if they can get Federal money, because they want to get off the hook.

Nevertheless, we are not going to change human nature by any legislation which is enacted here. This is another one of those wonderful programs, those ideals—perhaps another beautiful dream—which in the end will be most expensive and take us one more step deeper into a great national debt which may soon mean the bankruptcy of this country. It will, undoubtedly, if deficit giveaway is continued. This is a part of a general program of always financing new projects through the selling of Federal bonds and adding to our national debt. That is what it will mean.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correct in assuming that most of those who are so enthusiastic for this bill will be as enthusiastic in support of the foreign giveaway bill, the \$3½ billion that is proposed to be given to foreign countries? How can the taxpayer of this country continue to finance the annual multibillion dollar foreign giveaway program and initiate new and costly programs such as this?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot answer that question, except to say that some people vote for every spending program that comes along, while others feel they have some fiscal responsibility to the people back home.

Mr. GROSS. How about the question of waiving points of order on the bill? Is that not a good reason to vote against the rule?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps the reason why the points of order are to be waived is because "they" had the votes to do so in the Rules Committee.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I have received many letters from employees of railroads urging me to support this bill on the basis that it will assist the railroads in protecting their positions. I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio can tell us how that might occur.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I doubt very much that under the present bill there would be any real help to any employee of the railroads, and certainly there would not be any permanent help.

Let me say to the gentleman that I live in a community only some 35 miles by rail from Cincinnati. I can remember the old days, when we had what were called commuter or accommodation trains. We had as many as 30 trains a day going into Cincinnati, and 30 trains coming back, and nearly everyone rode

these trains. Today a person cannot get any train to stop to take him into Cincinnati, because everybody now rides in automobiles.

Perhaps we should not let our friends on the east coast know it, but there are a lot of people throughout the country who are riding automobiles today, or traveling in airplanes, and so very few interested in commuter trains or in subways, and will not be.

Let me predict the American people will continue to build highways and to drive automobiles, until perhaps some other vehicle which is more convenient may be invented.

I can point to Cincinnati again, as an example in my own State. They built a subway there several years ago. By the time they got the blooming thing built, they found it could not operate efficiently and the people did not want to use it. But it is down there, just as good as new. So if you need a new subway in Boston, you should get in touch with the officials of Cincinnati, for they might give it to you at a cheap price. You might be able to get a good bargain.

I can point to other cities in the United States, and to examples in other countries, where it has been proved that a lot of train commuter service and so on sounded mighty enticing, and very good, but did not work out.

There is a mass transportation problem, as everybody recognizes in some large cities. Some cities like Cleveland, Ohio, have been solving it on their own. After all, it is a local responsibility and not a national responsibility, to take care of transportation problems in a local community.

That is what we are trying to do out in Ohio, if we are permitted to do so, and are not taxed to death by the Federal Government to support programs of this type in other sections of the country. We have a way of meeting our own obligations through State and local government, rather than appealing to the Federal Government for whatever we may want, or, thinking that somehow or other there is a magic source from which the Federal Government gets the money paid out of our Treasury here in Washington. There is no such magic source. Every penny spent by the Federal Government is first paid into the Treasury either in the form of taxes earned the hard way by American citizens too often, or it represents borrowed money which our children and great grandchildren yet unborn will have to pay off.

It is just possible, gentlemen of this House, that the children of tomorrow and of the future tomorrows may have some problems of their own to meet when these debts we are now incurring, because we have failed to meet our own obligations in our own time in our own way, finally fall due. If any charge can be made in history—and it will be made, in my opinion—against the present generation, it is that we have failed to meet our own responsibilities but have found an easy way, or thought we did, to enjoy, not only our own income, but to have our children's children yet unborn pay part of the freight for us. Personally, I am opposed to that, and I think the

House of Representatives should be opposed to it. I hope they are.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Ohio feels there would be no advantage to any of the employees of the railroads?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not think there will be any permanent advantage. Of course not. Some workers may drive to work in automobiles, temporarily, or for a little while, if they start up a new commuter system, but that system will not last long.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank you very much.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of this bill, a bill which has been strongly recommended both by President Kennedy and President Johnson as being urgently needed in the national interest.

I desire also to commend the great Committee on Banking and Currency for the work that it has done on this matter and for the excellent committee report in which it points out both the magnitude of the problem and the need for the program recommended to solve it.

Before proceeding, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a minute to pay a word of tribute to the distinguished author and manager of this bill, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], not only for the work that he has done in reference to this legislation but for the brilliant, constructive, and progressive record he has written in this House over the years. His voluntary retirement is a great loss to this Nation. I commend him, as we all do, for his dedicated service and his remarkable accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged, as have most Members of the House, to see, over the past several years, the spectacular population growth in the Washington metropolitan area. We have seen large areas surrounding our Nation's Capital change from open space to sprawling suburbs. Accompanying this tremendous expansion, for miles beyond the borders of the District of Columbia, has been a spectacular increase in the number of automobiles in the area. With this has come increasing traffic congestion and a considerable lengthening of the time of the daily journey-to-work and other travel. This is not only the travel from suburbs to downtown Washington but within the city, and between the many large and growing suburban centers surrounding the Capital City.

We are a rich and prosperous Nation. Our affluence is no accident but the product of a form of government that encourages the healthy competition of free enterprise. This has made possible the tremendous growth of our automotive industry, spurred on in large part by the restless temperament of our people who

want, and are willing and financially able, to pay for the privilege of mobility.

We have encouraged this desire of our people to use their automobiles. We have, as a Nation, devoted a large share of Federal, State, and local resources to building magnificent highways that make mobility possible. The Federal Government alone has expended and earmarked more than \$20 billion for the building of the urban highway portion of the interstate highway systems, in addition to an annual expenditure of about \$250 million for other urban highways. In carrying out these programs, I think our highway industry must be commended for a most significant contribution to the development of our urban areas.

The transportation problem of our urban areas cannot, and should not, be blamed on this increasing reliance of our people on the automobile. While the investment of Federal funds for highway improvements has encouraged the use of the automobile, virtually nothing has been done to give our people a reasonable choice between private and public transportation. This is the gap that the pending mass transportation bill would help to fill. Without a choice, traffic congestion will inevitably increase and our cities will increasingly lose their economic vitality.

Shortly after taking office, President Johnson faced this problem. In his message on housing and community development he said:

Efficient transportation systems are essential to our urban communities. Each local system should be tailored to its particular needs—existing and prospective—and the proper mixture of good highways and mass transit facilities should be developed to permit safe, efficient movement of people and goods in our metropolitan centers.

A matching grant mass transit program along the lines proposed by the administration was approved by the Senate last year (S. 6) and reported favorably to the House by its Committee on Banking and Currency (H.R. 3881). I urge early enactment of the mass transit program as basic to the development and redevelopment of our Nation's cities.

Just last week at the dedication of the new rapid transit system in the San Francisco Bay area, the President said:

We must develop adequate alternative means of transportation or the coming crisis of congestion may do more to frustrate the growth and development of America than all the burning deserts and barren mountains which stood in the path of our ancestors a century ago.

I have listened to the argument that the urban mass transportation problem is not one for the Federal Government

but is purely a local problem. This argument is false and futile. It ignores the indisputable fact that the economic strength of our urban areas is of vital importance to the economic welfare of our Nation. Our urban areas generate the preponderant part of the Nation's gross national product and produce a disproportionately large percentage of our Federal taxes. If we are to preserve a continuing healthy national economy, we must be sure that our urban areas continue to be prosperous.

Those who oppose Federal help for improving local mass transportation must ignore the very great financial problems our localities face. It is not only that they are subject to strict legal limitations on borrowing for capital improvements. The facts are indisputable that local public agencies—State and municipal—are incurring debt for their capital needs at many times the rate of the Federal Government. At the same time, the tremendous growth of our cities is placing steadily increasing demands for local capital improvements.

I feel very strongly that the problem we face is national in scope and can only be solved by our people as a nation.

But to say that this must be a national problem does not mean that it must be solved by the Federal Government alone. The proposed urban mass transportation program is not solely a Federal program. It is a program that requires substantial local participation. Comprehensive local planning is a prerequisite to Federal financial assistance. And these must be non-Federal funds—local funds—of at least one-half the amount to be provided by the Federal Government. This is in keeping with a sound concept of cooperation among the Federal Government, State governments, and local communities—a type of cooperation that has been called "creative federalism."

We have been hearing again—as we did in the 1930's—the anguished query, "Where is the money coming from?" Social security and other programs that were then considered socialistic and likely to bankrupt our Nation, are now widely accepted. And despite prophecies of gloom and doom, we have prospered. Our Nation will continue to grow and prosper only if we have the courage to make sound investments of public funds in public transportation and other capital improvements that are needed for our continued growth and the development of our resources.

I expect that in the debate on this bill, there will be many cries of alarm about the Federal public debt. Let us recall that in 1946 our national public debt was

about 27 percent more than our gross national product. Today, with about a 16 percent increase in the public debt, it is about half of the gross national product.

During the same period, since 1946, our Federal public debt, on a per capita basis, has decreased by about 20 percent, while local public debt has increased by nearly 300 percent.

We are a strong and prosperous Nation. We must continue to be strong and prosperous. This will be possible only if we recognize and face up to problems threatening our continued prosperity.

We need to provide a sound balance between public and private transportation in our urban areas, to preserve and increase the economic vitality of this vital segment of our Nation's economy. Federal financial assistance—in cooperation with State and local efforts—is necessary to accomplish this.

The proposed program of Federal aid is a modest one—\$500 million for 3 years. I am not concerned that it could possibly grow over the years ahead. Let us remember that the program is a limited one and that it can be extended and expanded only by congressional action. I am confident that the Congress will carefully examine the results of the program before granting additional authorizations.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe we must enact this urban mass transportation bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a fair question to ask at the outset: Why are we suddenly faced with this problem of subsidizing mass transit? Certainly, it is not because of the inability of private and municipally owned companies to raise capital for improvements. In the minority report written more than a year ago, it is pointed out that in October 1962, just a few months prior to the hearings on this bill, the New York City Transit Authority sold \$50 million of gross revenue bonds in the private market with maturities up to 25 years at roughly 3.15 percent rate of interest. Again, in August of 1963, almost a year later, the New York City Transit sold \$38 million more, bearing interest of roughly 3.3 percent. The record of municipal financing makes it clear that the largest cities in the United States—those complaining the most of mass transportation problems—are having no difficulty financing capital improvements in transportation or in any other endeavor that they undertake. Just look at the record:

Municipal financing for mass transit by the 10 largest cities in the United States (excluding the District of Columbia), 1962-63, as reported in the pink sheets of the Weekly Bond Buyer

City	Issue	Amount	Net interest cost	Date
Detroit.....	Public utility street railway.....	\$1,000,000	2.57 percent.....	Mar. 27, 1962
New York.....	Rapid transit railroads.....	5,000,000	2.57 percent.....	Apr. 24, 1962
	New York City Transit Authority.....	50,900,000	3.15 percent.....	Oct. 17, 1962
Chicago.....	Chicago Transit Authority.....	7,500,000	3.20 percent.....	May 1, 1963
New York.....	New York City Transit Authority.....	38,300,000	3.32 percent.....	Aug. 7, 1963
Philadelphia.....	Railway passenger cars and transit improvement.....	13,500,000	3.32 percent.....	Nov. 13, 1963

Municipal financing by the 10 largest cities in the United States (excluding the District of Columbia) for the year 1963 as reported in the pink sheets of the Weekly Bond Buyer

City	Issue	Amount	Net interest cost	Date
Los Angeles	Department of water and power waterworks revenue	\$12,000,000	(Basis 3.12 percent)	Jan. 23, 1963
	Athens-Woodcrest Waterworks District No. 1	200,000	3.70 percent	Jan. 15, 1963
	Series D, consisting of fire department and recreation and park	14,000,000	2.78 percent	Feb. 19, 1963
	Department of water and power electric plant revenue	21,000,000	(Basis 2.96 percent)	Mar. 20, 1963
	Waterworks district No. 35	300,000	(Basis of 4.24 percent)	Mar. 5, 1963
	Flood control district (storm drain)	15,000,000	3.04 percent	Apr. 23, 1963
	Los Angeles unified school district	25,000,000	3.09 percent	Oct. 1, 1963
	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, waterworks revenue	12,000,000	(Basis 3.18 percent)	Oct. 9, 1963
	Department of water and power, electric plant revenue	24,000,000	(Basis 3.34 percent)	Nov. 20, 1963
	Transit authority (equipment trust revenue certificate)	7,500,000	3.20 percent	May 1, 1963
Chicago	Park district, consisting of park improvement, park improvement for community conservation areas	6,000,000	2.88 percent	May 14, 1963
	Chicago, consisting of bridge and viaduct, municipal building	5,000,000	2.85 percent	May 29, 1963
	Public building commission	87,000,000	3.35 percent	June 26, 1963
Baltimore	Baltimore, consisting of sewer loan, conduit loan, city jail loan, water loan, school loan, hospital building loan, recreation and parks building loan, public parks building loan, medical examiner's building loan, central garage building loan, Jones Falls Valley Park loan, urban renewal loan, fire building and facilities loan, women's detention building loan, public library loan	47,500,000	3.07 percent	Oct. 1, 1963
	Revenue, consisting of water supply system	10,500,000	3.16 percent	Apr. 9, 1963
	Automobile parking system	1,000,000	3.66 percent	Do.
Detroit	Detroit, consisting of public sewer, general public improvement	9,205,000	3.21 percent	Apr. 16, 1963
	Detroit, consisting of public library, rehabilitation	1,300,000	3.04 percent	Do.
	Detroit motor vehicle highway fund	1,000,000	2.59 percent	Do.
	Detroit, consisting of rehabilitation, general public improvement, public utility lighting	5,950,000	3.35 percent	Sept. 17, 1963
	Detroit, consisting of motor vehicle highway fund, public utility street railway	5,450,000	3.04 and 3.01 percent	Do.
	Airport revenue	1,300,000	3.48 percent	Do.
	Street and alley paving special assessment	120,000	2.88 percent	Do.
	School district (school construction)	10,740,000	2.90 percent	Jan. 16, 1963
	Public buildings and improvement	14,765,000	2.98 percent	Feb. 19, 1963
	Mehlville School District (school)	1,560,000	3.24 percent	Do.
St. Louis	Hancock Place School District	1,100,000	3.19 percent	Mar. 5, 1963
	Pattonville School District No. 4-3	1,150,000	3.07 percent	Feb. 28, 1963
	Public improvement	5,000,000	2.97 percent	Apr. 23, 1963
	Afton School District	450,000		Apr. 22, 1963
	Parkway Consolidated School District	1,150,000	3.14 percent	June 26, 1963
	Parking facilities revenue	350,000		Aug. 30, 1963
	Kirkwood School District R-7	350,000		Do.
	Afton Fire Protection District	80,000		Oct. 31, 1963
	Various purpose	108,200,000	2.93 percent	Jan. 29
	do	108,720,000	2.88 percent	Apr. 24
New York	do	103,000,000	2.94 percent	July 23
	Transit authority	38,300,000	3.32 percent	Aug. 7
	Limited-profit housing loan	25,550,000	3.66 percent	Sept. 10
	Various-purpose city improvement	118,700,000	3.19 percent	Oct. 23
	City school district (school building)	10,000,000	2.77 percent	Jan. 21
	Electric light and powerplant and system extension mortgage revenue	12,000,000	2.92 percent	Apr. 2
	Various purpose, consisting of public service machine and equipment, traffic equipment, public service storage and repair building, airport improvement, urban renewal, general sewer, port development, sewage disposal, recreation, city's portion paving	13,150,000	2.88 percent	June 25
	City school district (school building)	10,000,000	2.98 percent	Oct. 24, 1963
	Sanitary storm sewer construction	750,000	(Basis of 2.93 percent)	Dec. 2, 1963
	School district (school)	15,000,000	2.97 percent	Jan. 8, 1963
Philadelphia	Various capital improvement	37,225,000	2.94 percent	Apr. 3, 1963
	Public improvement	25,000,000	3.03 percent	May 29, 1963
	Airport system revenue	6,000,000	3.82 percent	Do.
Houston	Independent school district (schoolhouse)	10,000,000	3.21 percent	Sept. 10, 1963
	Corporate-purpose public improvement	12,350,000	2.53 percent	Jan. 22, 1963
	Metropolitan sewerage	5,775,000	2.58 percent	Jan. 29, 1963
Milwaukee	Waterworks mortgage revenue	5,000,000	3.10 percent	July 24, 1963
	Metropolitan sewerage	7,255,000	2.77 percent	Oct. 1, 1963

Recent revenue bond sales

Date sold	Issue	Offering scale
May 12, 1964	New Mexico, highway revenue	2.65 (5 years)
May 27, 1964	Los Angeles, water revenue	2.15 (1 year) to 3.40 (30 years)
June 3, 1964	Miami, Fla., water revenue	2.80 (5 years) to 3.35 (20 years)
May 27, 1964	San Diego, Calif., water revenue	2.15 (1 year) to 3.40 (30 years)
June 2, 1964	Sebring, Fla., electric revenue	2.35 (1 year) to 3.65 (25 years)
Apr. 20, 1964	Atlanta, Ga., airport revenue	2.90 (5 years) to 3.80 (30 years)
Feb. 25, 1964	New York State, dormitory revenue	2.75 (5 years) to 4.50 (30 years)
May 26, 1964	New Jersey, highway authority revenue	2.20 (1 year) to 3.30 (20 years)

Mr. Speaker, just by way of comparison, look at the recent U.S. Treasury offerings. In the refunding of May 15, 1964, 18-month notes bore interest of 4 percent and 10-year bonds, 4½ percent. Now, I ask you, which unit of government is in the best position to borrow the money for capital improvements? Obviously, the municipalities have shown that they have the capability and can borrow at lower rates of interest than the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, this problem of mass transit arises chiefly because of the increased use of the private automobile. The proponents of this bill clearly admit these facts in the majority report. The

testimony at the hearings made clear that the number of privately owned automobiles in the United States had more than doubled between the years 1946 and 1960. During the same period of time the number of passengers on mass transit systems had declined so that in 1960 it was only 43 percent of the 1946 figures. It should be obvious that the convenience and flexibility of owning an automobile has become a part of our way of life. It is a mark of achievement of the young person beginning to make his way in the world. It has literally become a status symbol and the two-car families are now in the majority. Secretary of Commerce Hodges himself says that 85 percent of

the total daily travel is by private automobile. Why should the 85 percent have to subsidize the remaining 15 percent?

This problem is basically a local problem and a free enterprise problem. It is local because the service, the routes, and the demands will vary in every community, depending upon size and makeup. Because several communities have a problem does not make it national, for the solution in each case may be different. The decision that the mayors and the members of the city commissions must make in determining whether a particular community can continue to support a form of public transportation is only slightly different than the decision which must be made as to whether the same community can afford garbage collection and police and fire protection. Essentially, that decision is the determination of what services the citizens in the particular community desire to have provided and have expressed a willingness to pay the cost. I am not impressed because numerous mayors testified in behalf of such a program, for it only means to me that they would prefer to solve their problems by coming to the Federal

Government without facing the unpleasant task of asking their own constituents to pay for the program.

Let us not forget, however, that this is also a free enterprise problem. As of the date of the hearings, at least 92 percent of the transit systems in America were privately owned and only 8 percent were municipal. Under the provisions of this bill grants would be made only to States and local public bodies. Now, it is true a public body would not necessarily have to operate the transit facilities or the equipment purchased as a result of such a grant, and it could provide for their operation by mass or other arrangements. Certainly, however, this feature of the bill will increase the trend to public ownership of mass transit systems. If you do not believe my statement, then let me ask you why the AFL-CIO and organized labor in general have expressed so much concern with regard to the impact that public acquisition of private companies will have on the established status and bargaining rights of employees. Of course, you are encouraging the trend to private ownership, and that is why organized labor is concerned, and rightfully so.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of this Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963 will, in my judgment, have extremely harmful effects—not only on our Federal Government, but on local government as well. Why do I say that?

Insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, it will be harmful because it opens the door to a tremendous new spending program. No one could predict the overall cost but I have heard estimates ranging as high as \$20 to \$25 billion. The estimated value of the New York City Transit alone is in excess of \$2.5 billion. When you couple that with the value of the systems in Chicago, Philadelphia, and other cities across the country, you can readily see that the \$200 million per year as provided in this bill is only the beginning.

Just last week we raised the temporary limit on the national debt from \$309 to \$324 billion. I pointed out at the time that this was the seventh increase since I came to Congress, in January 1961, just 3½ years ago. Interest alone on this debt is now in excess of \$11 billion per year. It seems to me that this should cause all of us to ask ourselves—If there is such a problem in mass transportation, then who can best solve the problem and do it the cheapest? The answer is clearly local government and private enterprises.

But the enactment of this legislation will be even more harmful to local government. You do not make local government stronger by this sort of program. In fact, just the opposite is true—you make it weaker. You discourage local initiative when you take away local determination and bring the Federal Government into the picture.

The Cleveland case pointed out by the distinguished Member of the other body, Senator LAUSCHE, is a good example. The local commission started to solve the problem but then decided to postpone action and seek Federal aid instead. I

can tell you from my own experience as a mayor in a Michigan city of 100,000 population. No mayor had more bus problems than I had during that period of time. Do you know what this law would have done if it had been in effect? Not only would it have stifled local initiative in solving the problem, but it would have resulted in the continuation of numerous routes—at night, on Sundays, and in the early hours, which were clearly shown to be unprofitable and little used by the general public. As it was, we simply discontinued these unprofitable routes which so few people were using. If a Federal subsidy is available, however, no mayor will risk the wrath of even a few constituents in discontinuing a route, but he will ask for a Federal subsidy instead.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if this House is going to pass a mass transit bill and thereby insist that the Federal Government does have the responsibility for this problem, then we should not repeat the same mistake that we have made earlier. One of my basic objections to the area redevelopment legislation, which also came out of our committee, was that its benefits were so diluted that the truly depressed areas did not get the help they needed. This urban mass transportation bill is objectionable for the very same reason, and instead of the metropolitan areas that have demonstrated a problem receiving the help, the benefits will be spread—like the benefits from the Area Redevelopment Administration program—among every small village and hamlet in America with a population of 2,500 or more.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this bill be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, H.R. 3881, is highly controversial because it raises philosophical differences, as well as practical.

It is not strictly a partisan matter—for it has its opponents and proponents on both sides of the aisle.

Rather is it another disagreement between those who believe in a strong central government—a big and domineering government—which controls the purse strings and, therefore the wisdom of what should be done by all individuals and at all levels of government.

And, those who believe in people making their own decisions, using their own initiative, and in the ability of States and local government to handle their own problems more efficiently and more responsively to the will of the people—than can centralized bureaucracy.

The advocates of Federal intervention into the field of mass transit do so on the basis that it is a national problem. If one takes the position that everything

which effects the large urban areas is a national problem, they can make a point.

The majority, however, rests its position of national need partially, at least, on the statements of bus companies in smaller communities of their shrinking profits and the fact many companies are going out of business.

But, this conclusion does not recognize the change in the way of life in small cities—the change which the auto—and in some cases the family ownership of more than one auto—have brought. The decline in the use of buslines is, in itself, an indication of a change in "mores" rather than a crisis in community living brought on by a lack of transportation.

Proponents of Federal aid in this field also point to the Federal highway subsidy to back up their premise that transportation, and specifically mass transit, should be considered a national problem.

Here, too, they strain too hard. The road network is, of course, national in scope. It is interconnecting and interdependent. Therefore, it is essential that its standards be uniform, its markings the same, and the planning national in concept.

Thus, there is a vital difference—for in highways, uniformity is the key—but such even the staunchest advocates of Federal aid for mass transit would abhor—recognizing in theory at least, that, at best, mass transit is an area problem, with different solutions possible in each area. Moreover, highway users pay for highways—not general taxpayers.

Actually, referring to the problem as a national one—excluding the desire of all local governments for greater financial ability to meet their problems—is purely pragmatic and political.

My esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, clearly demonstrated this when he said to Dr. Weaver:

Dr. Weaver, if this bill is to become law, in the House of Representatives, we need as broad-based support as we can get, and not everybody lives in major cities, especially the Congressmen do not.

Once again we have the same situation as under ARA where the concept of the Federal Government attacking a specific need in specific areas of need was broadened for practical political reasons; and the shotgun was substituted for the rifle.

No, I think mass transit is, as I said, at best an area problem, and it is being tackled as such by the communities involved.

That there is a need in some areas, no one can deny. The question, of course, is how great—of what proportions, what dimension—and what steps—at what cost—must be taken to meet them.

The Federal Government has invaded areas of local government jurisdiction and concern before—in many areas. In almost every instance it has been begun on the basis of the inability of the locality to provide the necessary funds.

Here, too, almost every witness before our committee testified that the reason they supported the bill was purely monetary. They felt that either private enterprise or local government, or both, were capable of planning a balanced system, and of running it, but that the

fare box and local tax methods were insufficient for their needs.

But the fact is that in the high density areas—where the real need exists—the ability to obtain financing is as good, or better, than at the Federal level. My colleague [Mr. HARVEY] has discussed and will discuss this in greater detail but let me just mention two examples of what this Federal subsidy does.

San Francisco faced this problem and passed a bond issue. Their people were willing to dig down deep for a need they recognized. But, nonetheless, representatives of that area were before our committee asking for help—to expand the system further? No—to reduce the local taxpayer's cost, even though he had agreed to bear it. I guess money from Washington seems free. And, in my own State—in Cleveland—the transit board voted to extend the transit system to the Cleveland Airport; and then came the suggestion that the Federal Government would pick up some—if not all—of the tab, and two members of the majority of the board changed their vote to wait for Federal aid—despite the fact that they had previously thought that they had sufficient funds on hand or authorized by the people to do the job.

This, of course, is one of the tragedies of Federal aid. Not only is local initiative destroyed, but local priorities and local timing is completely dependent upon a Federal handout policy which cannot help but delay, rather than accelerate the local solution until the Federal allocation to that locality is forthcoming after all the redtape is completed.

The demands upon government at all levels today are tremendous, and increasing daily. And yet, despite the increase in gross national product, the increase in the debt, and the cheapening of the dollar, there is not enough money to do everything.

It had been my intent to introduce a substitute for this bill, a substitute which would merely have returned to the States a percent of the individual income collected in that State. Such additional revenue to the States would have provided funds for State responsibilities and permitted them to return some avenues of revenue to local government to meet their problems at their own priorities and their own initiative. However, the Rules Committee did not grant my request for a rule making such a motion specifically in order and the Parliamentarian informs me it would not be germane.

It is my hope that the Ways and Means Committee will tackle, next year, a real tax revision law—and in so doing, will consider such an approach—so as to return the opportunity for initiative and decision on local matters to local government.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time remaining on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I take this time on the rule to advise each of the Members, as I have also tried to do by a letter directed to the Members, as to an amend-

ment that in all probability is going to be offered relating to the labor provisions of this bill. I would commend them to your attention at this time because I think they deserve your study before the debate expires and we come to act upon the bill.

I am sure there may be many Members of the House who will wish, perhaps, to vote for this bill and may want to support a mass transit program. However, if they examine carefully the existing provisions of section 10 relating to labor and the proposed amendment, of which I have given a copy to each Member in the form that I believe it is going to be proposed, they may arrive at a far different conclusion in that regard.

The labor provisions of the mass transit bill have been subject to change at every stage in the consideration of this legislation. On the Senate side, the labor provisions in the administration bill as introduced were scrapped in the recommendation made by the subcommittee to the full committee. The full committee in reporting the bill, scrapped the recommendation from its subcommittee. When the bill was considered on the floor of the Senate, the committee-reported provisions were scrapped by the Senate and a substitute floor amendment was adopted.

On the House side, the history is similar. The labor provisions of the administration bill as introduced were disowned and a substitute proposed by the Secretary of Labor at the time when he appeared as a witness on the bill. His proposed substitute was junked by the committee and a different version appears in the bill as reported by the committee. On this bill we will be confronted with still another set of changes in the proposed amendment to this section (10(c)) of the bill. And I might add, this amendment if adopted would not conform the labor provisions to those of the Senate-passed bill in at least four important respects.

There has not been any committee hearing on these changes. There has been no executive session of the committee to consider them. Indeed most members of this House only today have had an opportunity to even see or hear what these changes are.

I think this is unfortunate. These labor provisions are of tremendous importance. The proposal before us would have Federal law override State and local law. The proposal before us, by Federal law would require that there be featherbedding in municipal employment. The rights of laid off municipal employees would be subordinated to those of laid off transit workers of municipally acquired transit systems. Veterans' preferences in municipal employment could be very adversely affected. Make no mistake about it, these labor provisions involve very important policy and administrative considerations. I hope the House will take the time to develop an understanding of the full implications that are involved in this proposal.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Would the gentleman support this legislation if the labor amendment were not adopted?

Mr. TAFT. I do not expect to support this measure whether or not the labor amendment is adopted.

Mr. MOORHEAD. The gentleman is opposed to it?

Mr. TAFT. I believe the present provisions of the labor section of the bill are unsatisfactory as they stand today. They are improper. It will make them worse if the amendment which is to be proposed is proposed and adopted.

Whether one supports the bill or not is not relevant to whether we should, as the amendment would do, import into the whole area of mass transit the headaches we are now having and have had for many years in the railway labor situation.

Mr. MOORHEAD. In either event, no matter how the amendment comes out, the gentleman is opposed to the bill?

Mr. TAFT. As the gentleman knows, and as shown in the report on the bill, I opposed the bill in the committee and intend to oppose it here on the floor. This derogates not one whit from the unsoundness of the labor amendment, the damage that can be done to the labor situation in the mass transit field, if the amendment to be proposed is adopted. Some of that damage will be done even if the amendment is not adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Ohio has been questioned concerning his position. The gentleman is opposing the bill, I take it, because he has a real sense of responsibility with respect to the finances of this country and the inability of the taxpayers of the Nation to pay bills of this kind, considering the debt and deficit situation existing today.

Mr. TAFT. As is set out in great detail in the last item in the minority views—and I signed those views—I certainly concur with the gentleman. This is a major consideration.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this great Nation of ours, the wealthiest in the history of time, surely can afford a mass transportation system, schools for its children, and every other worthy program which is currently before the Congress.

As one of the previous speakers said, our transportation system today is 94 percent private enterprise and 6 percent public utilities or owned by municipalities.

The private enterprise portion today—mostly the feeder lines—is caught in a vicious cycle. It is caught in a cycle of rising costs, fewer passengers, and higher rates.

This is a bill by which we are trying to aid and to assist private enterprise.

This country of ours must have mass transportation. We do not want the municipalities, the State governments, or the Federal Government to take over

the system. We want to aid private citizens in their running of this type of transportation.

That is the purpose behind the bill. I hope the rule will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS— COMMUNICATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Committee on Public Works, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1964.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: Pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on June 23, 1964, approved prospectuses for the following public building projects, which were transmitted to this committee from the General Services Administration:

Nogales, Ariz. (revised): Border station (construction and alteration).

Derby Line, Vt. (revised): Border station (construction).

Cape Girardeau, Mo.: Federal office building (construction).

Ogden, Utah: IRS Regional Service Center (construction).

San Antonio, Tex.: (a) post office building (revised) (construction), (b) courthouse and Federal office building (construction), and (c) post office and courthouse (alteration).

Small public building projects for the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (25 projects, as follows): Anniston, Gadsden, Ala.; Prescott, Ariz.; El Dorado, Ark.; Huntington Park, Calif.; Torrington, Conn.; Rock Island, Ill.; Pikeville, Ky.; Cumberland, Md.; Haverhill, Mass.; Flint, Mich.; Austin, Minn.; Bloomfield, Irvington, N.J.; Olean, Watertown, N.Y.; Ambridge, Hazleton, Philadelphia (NE), Pittsburgh (E), Pa.; Pawtucket, R.I.; Rock Hill, S.C.; Sherman, Tex.; Beckley, Welch, W. Va.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3881) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3881, with Mr. Moss in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WINNALL] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the administration's mass transit bill, H.R. 3881, has been proposed in order to help local transit systems overcome the traffic congestion that is now paralyzing our communities. All over the country transportation companies are caught between rising costs and declining patronage so that fares have had to go higher and higher and higher. As a result, more and more passengers have taken to private automobiles and made the congestion worse. It is a vicious circle that has to be corrected.

The Committee on Banking and Currency has worked long and hard on this bill. In 1962 a subcommittee held 2 weeks of hearings and took testimony from 66 witnesses, nearly all of whom supported the legislation. The bill was reported out by a bipartisan vote of 16 to 7 but was not acted on by that Congress.

Last year the administration again submitted its request for legislation to help local transit systems, and my distinguished colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], introduced the proposal, H.R. 3881. Hearings were held before the full committee with witnesses representing the administration, local government, private bus and train operators, labor and business organizations, and others interested in transit problems. Again, the overwhelming weight of the testimony was favorable to the bill, and again the bill was reported by a strong bipartisan vote—this time 22 to 7.

It was these hearings that convinced me and a substantial majority of the committee of how urgent is the need for Federal aid to meet local transportation problems. Serious traffic congestion is obvious in all of our larger cities, but we were particularly impressed with the testimony that smaller communities also need help, and in many cases their need is urgent. As one mayor of a small southern town told our committee, the availability of local bus service is often an important factor in the decision of a private investor whether or not to establish a local plant. Transit service is vital to those who cannot afford to own and operate private automobiles. In addition, there are millions of Americans who are not physically able to drive cars, particularly among the 17 million elderly citizens—those age 65 and over. The problem also exists for those too young to drive or those who have some physical infirmity. The need is not confined to these groups, however; there are many people who prefer public transportation and if adequate service and good equip-

ment is available find it better suited to their needs.

It is apparent that buses, commuter railroads, and other public transportation systems are a very real necessity to millions of people in our towns and cities. The rapid growth in our urban population is making this need more urgent, but at the same time the facts show that financially the transit industry has been fighting a losing battle. In the period from the end of World War II to 1961, the number of passengers declined 58 percent, transit employment dropped 38 percent. The return on investment has fallen to less than 2 percent, according to the American Transit Association. While there are some cities where transit companies still operate in the black, the overall picture is one of a distressed industry. Neither the ingenuity of private operators nor the concern of local public officials has been enough to keep many companies from going into the red and sometimes going out of business altogether.

Historically, transportation has been an important concern of the Federal Government. Already, we have a \$41 billion highway program and about half of that money is going into urban areas. However, there is a limit to the amount of highways which can be built within our towns and cities. Many communities have already passed the point of diminishing returns in reliance on the private automobile. We all recognize the need for further improvement in our streets, roads and freeways, but at the same time there is growing recognition that the proper role of mass transit is being slighted seriously. At present there is no program of aid for this vital industry. The pending bill would redress that imbalance.

I would like to emphasize that this program relies entirely upon local initiative and requires local matching grants. It is entirely up to the people of each community whether or not they want to participate in the program and to what extent. What it will do is make it possible for our towns and cities to achieve balanced local transportation systems in which both the private automobile and mass transit will play their proper role.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation meets an urgent national need and I urge its adoption.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] for the purpose of continuing the opening statement for the committee on this bill, H.R. 3881, such time as he may desire.

Mr. RAINS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we are now taking up for consideration one of the most important measures to come before this Congress and one which President Johnson has put high on his list of "must" legislation for this year—the urban mass transit bill. This proposal has received intensive study in both Houses of Congress in recent years and the need for it is well established. Traffic problems are growing steadily worse in towns and cities of every size as the rapid growth in our urban population outruns our ability to provide streets, highways, and

parking facilities and as mass transit services and the financial situation of bus and railway companies in many communities steadily declines.

The program of partial Federal grants contained in the pending bill, H.R. 3881, was submitted by the administration in 1962 and again in 1963. In urging the passage of this program, the late President John F. Kennedy said:

Our national welfare requires the provision of good urban transportation with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport to help shape as well as serve urban growth.

President Johnson has thrown his full weight behind this important measure. In his message to the Congress on housing and community development last January, he stated:

Efficient transportation systems are essential to our urban communities. Each local system should be tailored to its particular needs—existing and prospective—and the proper mixture of good highways and mass transit facilities should be developed to permit safe, efficient movements of people and goods in our metropolitan centers. I urge early enactment of the mass transit program as basic to the development and redevelopment of our Nation's cities.

Mr. Chairman, the problems which this bill seeks to solve affect every one of us. It affects the millions of people who use mass transit daily; it affects those who find that driving their own cars becomes more difficult every day as traffic jams become worse and parking more difficult; it affects the whole Nation because our cities account for most of the business activity of the country and anything that makes them inefficient hampers our national growth; and, finally, it affects all of us who recognize that unsolved traffic and transit problems weaken local government and reduce the tax revenues on which they depend.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is by the very nature of the problem a complex bill and very frankly, by the very nature of the problem it has to meet, it is a controversial bill. In the beginning of the long hearings in which I have participated on this bill before the subcommittee and the full committee, I wanted to know in my own mind—and the gentleman from Ohio was correct a while ago when he said that this bill, if it is to be enacted by the Congress of the United States, must meet a national need—whether it was to meet a national problem. If it is to be enacted there must be a national problem.

I am one, and I say this sincerely, who if a matter is truly a local problem, do not want the Federal Government participating in it. But on things that mightily affect the welfare of the entire Nation, many people are prone to say, "Oh, that is a local problem."

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the witnesses—witness after witness, mayor after mayor, private enterprise man after private enterprise man—and I invite your attention to the list of the witnesses before the committee—established beyond peradventure of a doubt that there is a national problem in mass transit.

Mr. Chairman, approximately three-fourths of all people in America live in cities and towns. It is also true that

about four-fifths of every tax dollar paid in America is paid by a man or a woman who lives in a city or a town.

I came from a small town. This mass transit bill will be of very little concern to many of the citizens in my State, but I honestly believe, and I believe you believe, that we are here not as the local Representatives of a particular district only, but I believe we are here as National Representatives. I believe that is a part of the duty and obligation that all of us respect and assumed.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if the lack of mass transit is strangling the growth of the cities of America and if the cities of America are the coffers out of which this Nation is supported, if that is true, then it is a national problem.

Mr. Chairman, we can go back, and if the members of the committee have read Gibbon's history of "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," we find that the empire perhaps fell for many reasons, but one of the reasons was that the cities strangled to death. They became within themselves completely disassociated with the federal or state or national government of that day and they died. When those cities died, the nation died.

Mr. Chairman, I do not stand here just speaking for city people; I am as much concerned for people who live on the farms across this country, because I was born and reared on one. But I recognize that the growth of this great Nation, which we all love and cherish above everything else, is wrapped up in the prosperity and the welfare of the great cities of America. I believed it when I offered the recent urban renewal legislation. I believe sincerely if you improve the downtown hearts of the great cities of America, it is a good business investment. I believe that in any business if you never put back into that business any dollars at all, that business will fall apart.

Mr. Chairman, the prosperity—and this is factual statement—the prosperity, the welfare, and the growth of the cities of America are important to our Government, because that is where we get the taxes.

I am simply saying if the cities of America are—and the record shows it beyond doubt, all you have to do is look around you—strangling to death with traffic problems, we need to do something about it at the Federal level.

Mr. Chairman, one other thing which I think we should remember about the bill is this: This bill actually is a private enterprise bill. The gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] was eminently correct a moment ago in the figures which he used that show that over 90 percent of the mass transit systems of this country are owned by private enterprise, and before I get through with my participation in this bill, I intend to offer an amendment that even more strongly supports private enterprise, than the present section does.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not intended to give to the cities a club for public ownership at all.

If the members of the Committee will read the bill carefully and report, they will see that in some way or other we

have got to give aid and assistance to the private enterprise business of this country so it can provide the mass transit solution.

Mr. Chairman, I would be the last fellow, I believe, in the world to say anything that in the least would cast any reflection at all upon the great highway program. I say that I regard that as the one outstanding truly great public works achievement of the Eisenhower administration. It is fantastic. It is the greatest public works program in the history of the world. There has never been one like it.

I would like to believe that we could build enough highways into the cities of this country to the point where everyone could drive his own automobile and have a place in which to park it.

But I know, and I know every man and woman here knows, there is not enough room in the cities of America to build the highways we would have to have, the overpasses and the underpasses; to build the parking lots at even a reasonable cost, to have streets and alleys we would need.

Whether we like it or not, the time is here in which people cannot depend entirely on private automobiles. Therefore, some other provision must be made.

The gentleman from Atlanta, Ga. [Mr. WELTNER], is here—my distinguished friend. I may have this percentage wrong, but I have been told that in Atlanta, Ga., 56 percent of all the land space in that great, growing, thriving city is given over to streets, highways, overpasses, and parking lots. Where are you going to build any more? How are you going to get them in and out? Forty-five percent of all the Federal aid money that we give to the highways—and I am proud to vote for it every time—goes to cities and towns. This is very expensive, and involves approximately \$20 billion. We need highways. But it is entirely possible that we can move more people in and out of the cities of the country for much less money than we are doing now.

And let me say one other word. There are people here who say to me, "Well, I am not interested in the bill because I do not have any traffic problems in my district." Back in the broad, open spaces of Alabama we do not have much either—but I will tell you one thing: We have big, broad, four-lane interstate highways, and the people from Ohio and New York help pay for them; therefore I feel as an American citizen that I am obligated in a small way, perhaps, to help the people of the great cities of the country pay for theirs. We are all in it together. We cannot hide out here. Some may say, "We do not need to look at that because it is not my problem, it is the Nation's problem."

In my judgment, this is as essential as housing bills. There is opposition always to a housing bill, but I think we have come to know there must be some type of housing legislation in this country year after year. I am not going to argue that now, but in about 3 weeks' time I will try to argue that.

But the gentleman from Ohio. [Mr. TART], is against this bill, and he attacks

it indirectly. He sent a letter about the labor amendment. I am going to offer an additional labor amendment, and it is going to be wrapped up with a private enterprise amendment. It is not going to affect any work laws; it is not going to affect the right of any State in any shape, form, or fashion. I say to the gentleman, and everybody knows already, that there can be no law written that will enable any strike against the town, city, State, or National Government, and there will be nothing in that which will attempt to involve it here. There will be the same type of protection that is already written in the Interstate Commerce Act affecting railroad employees and it will help bus employees likewise if a company is bought from the private owner. I think when the amendment is offered it will be obvious to everyone it is fair, not only to labor, but it is fair to private enterprise, and it will be fair to the cities and towns in the event they have public operations.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to briefly go step by step into the main and important items in the bill.

The first and basic provision of the bill is Federal grant assistance for mass transit equipment and facilities. I will say to my distinguished and beloved friend there is no back-door spending involved. It is absolutely 100 percent the appropriation method. The formula for determining the Federal grant is similar to that used under urban renewal. Grants can be made for up to two-thirds of the net cost of the project and the remaining one-third will have to be met by the local governments in cash. And an estimate will be made of the revenues of the transit system to determine the amount which can be financed from the fare box. That is subtracted from the estimated total cost of the project, and the net difference would be paid by Federal and local grants on a $\frac{2}{3}$ - $\frac{1}{3}$ basis.

I should like to point out also that the funds for this program are already in the President's budget request for fiscal 1965. If it should be enacted, actual cash outlays in the coming year would be only \$10 million because of the long-term nature of these projects. Because of the necessary time it would take to get underway, I intend to offer an amendment to cut the amount by \$125 million from \$500 million to \$375 million, when we get to the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

The second provision of the bill is a temporary emergency program of aid which recognizes that in many places something must be done quickly. This section would waive some of the planning requirements but would limit the Federal share of the net cost to only one-half instead of two-thirds. If the community, however, meets the full planning requirements within 3 years they then would be eligible for the two-thirds grant.

The third provision authorizes the appropriation of \$500 million spread over 3 years. Please note that I said "appropriation"; there is no so-called back-door financing involved. As I have just

said, I hope to offer an amendment to reduce it to \$375 million.

The fourth provision of the bill would permit a part of these funds to be used for demonstration projects to try to find more efficient ways of meeting our transit problem. Under this section up to \$30 million of new authority would be used for demonstration grants.

Fifth, the bill will provide relocation benefits for families displaced under the transportation program, similar to the benefits provided under the urban renewal program.

Sixth, the bill would require fair and equitable arrangements, as determined by the Administrator with the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of affected transit employees.

The bill will maintain or increase employment in the transit industry and, we are sure, halt the sharp decline which has been going on in recent years.

The chairman of the committee told you this bill was voted out of the committee by a bipartisan vote. I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and others who not only voted for the bill in committee but were active participants and supporters of the legislation in committee. It was voted out by a vote of 22 to 7.

This legislation has been studied at great length by our committee in hearings in 1962 and again in 1963. In those hearings, we took testimony from a great many witnesses representing local government, private bus operators, railroads, labor, industry, civic groups, and others interested in the problem. That testimony was overwhelmingly in favor of the legislation. Those hearings and the many reports and news stories published since then have firmly established several facts.

First, the problem which this bill is designed to meet is a serious one and the need for action is urgent. We are all familiar with the so-called population explosion and the rapid growth of towns and cities of every size. In spite of this, the number of people being served by mass transit has dropped off sharply and service has been reduced. The competition of the private automobile has cut deeply into the passenger volume of mass transit. Now, however, there is growing recognition that private automobiles cannot meet all of our local transportation needs no matter how many highways we build and meanwhile our investment in mass transit has been neglected.

All too often mass transit has been caught in a vicious spiral. Let me read to you, for example, how the operator of a private bus company in one Southern city recently described his predicament:

Since writing you last we were forced again to take the wrong road by a fare increase. Our projected formula indicated we would lose passengers as a result, and that in 14 months we would be back with the same amount of revenue, only with fewer riders. This is exactly what happened.

We find ourselves with a lot of old buses, expensive to operate and unattractive to customers. We have had to cancel some routes entirely. We reduce schedules but, as you know, when you spread out schedules it dis-

courages more riders. Our next desperate step would be to raise fares again, but at the end of a 12- to 15-month period we would be in a worse fix than now, so what do we do? Should we take this same course and wind up a year later with fewer riders and older equipment?

The experience of the company described in this letter is being repeated over and over again throughout the country. Mass transit, whether bus, rail, or subway, involves heavy capital investment and by its nature requires a certain minimum passenger volume because of its fixed costs. When ridership falls below that minimum, the company goes into the red even though there are thousands of passengers still dependent upon it daily.

The great need that this bill seeks to meet is for new equipment, equipment that the fare box presently without some aid and assistance, call it seed money or whatever you will, is unable to purchase, and it is a continuing vicious circle of higher fares and fewer passengers. The result is, and we firmly believe the record proves it, that if you had the equipment, which could be leased at a reasonable price to the owners of the private bus or rail transportation in this country, you would be able to see the fare box pick up with additional customers to where it would be self-supporting. I cannot guarantee this in any way. I cannot guarantee private enterprise is going to make a profit any time, but I do know we are going to lose money on the mass transit systems in this country unless some aid is given.

You know it seems every once in a while we talk about this as if this is all new. Railroads were built in this country by Federal aid clear across the country. From time immemorial we faced up to this problem in this way. We either give this type of aid and assistance or it becomes a matter of governmental ownership of the commuter railroads. So I think if we can, we better move in and give free enterprise the shot in the arm that it needs and keep out Government control and Government ownership.

We must not forget that there are many who do not have the option of using their own cars to drive to and from work or for shopping or other trips. Many people simply cannot afford to own and maintain a car and keep up the many expenses that go with it. Many of our elderly citizens either can no longer afford cars or are physically unable to drive them. The same thing is true of our millions of teenagers who are not old enough to drive as well as those who cannot drive because of some physical infirmity.

It is estimated that there are some 30 million people between the ages of 18 and 65 who do not have licenses to drive and need mass transit. For many people this is a matter of preference. However, people do insist on equipment that is comfortable and dependable—not 40-year-old commuter trains or 20-year-old buses. They also want good service without unreasonable crowding. This means schedules that meet their needs, and routes that are convenient to use. It means also adequate parking lots at sta-

tions or terminals in the area where they live.

Every time service is curtailed, more people are forced out onto the highway to add to existing congestion and some part of our present investment in mass transit facilities is lost and by all the evidence will have to be replaced eventually at a higher cost. The time for action on this critical problem is already overdue.

A second fact established by the hearings is the national nature of this problem. Already, over two-thirds of our population live in urban areas, and these towns and cities generate an even larger part of our national income, production, and Federal tax revenues. The Congress cannot be indifferent to the problems of these communities and the record shows that a great many of them are already faced with difficulties of major proportion and others will soon have to face up to the problem. The American Transit Association testified that there are 60 cities of 25,000 population or more who now have no mass transit service at all. The ATA further reports that since 1954 over 150 local transit companies have abandoned service, many of them in small towns.

The Federal Government cannot ignore this urban transportation problem. The continued economic vitality and growth of our urban areas is essential to our national welfare. Indeed, the welfare of all our citizens—rural and urban—is directly dependent upon the commerce and industry of our cities and towns. It has been estimated that more than 90 percent of the Nation's gross national product is generated in urban areas—a clear indication of the importance of urban economic vitality to the national welfare.

It is also clear that local government cannot afford the measures necessary to solve this problem entirely on their own. Rightly or wrongly, the Federal Government has largely preempted the most fruitful source of tax revenue through the Federal income tax which has the special feature that it cannot be escaped across State lines.

Before I came to the Congress, I was in the Alabama State Legislature. I was chairman of the cities and towns committee of that State, having to do with little cities and towns. I was a city attorney and I had to do with municipal government all the years before I came here. Since I have been here on the committee that I am a member of, I would say that we have had more municipal problems to be concerned with before us than nearly any other committee. I say that only to point out that I believe I know something about the problems of the cities and towns of America. It is easy, as my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan did, to cite the fact that in some specific instances on a bond of a specific type that you are able in certain cities to get a bond rate below what the Federal Government ordinarily pays. That is because of the tax-exempt feature.

The fact is that State and local government is straining its resources to the limit to meet the many and increasing needs of their people. Striking testi-

mony to this was given in a staff report in the Wall Street Journal of last February 18. That report stated:

The debts of America's States and towns have rocketed 448 percent since World War II. This increase in the little-noticed indebtedness of States and municipalities has far outstripped the growth of the highly publicized Federal debt, which has edged up only 13 percent in the same period.

In other words, this local debt increase is nearly 35 times the percentage increase of the Federal debt.

The report also points out that between 1946 and 1963 State and local debt on a per capita basis quadrupled from \$120 to \$467. During the same period Federal debt decreased on the same basis by one-fifth.

The Federal Government is already involved in this problem under the highway program. I can well imagine the dilemma of a mayor or city council confronted with a local traffic problem. If they seek to solve it through additional freeways and streets, they can obtain Federal grant assistance for 50 percent of the cost or in some cases 90 percent. On the other hand, if they want to improve bus or commuter rail service, they find there is no Federal assistance available at present. Under the heavy pressure of their immediate financial problems, they may be forced to turn to more freeways even though they believe that in the long run mass transit would be better. This bill seeks to redress that imbalance and enable the people of the community to choose more objectively.

The hearings also clearly established that the private automobile cannot meet all of our transit needs. Let me emphasize that there is no competition between this proposal and our great Federal aid highway program. I have always supported the highway program which is one of the greatest domestic economic efforts in our history. Clearly, there is still a tremendous need for more highway construction. However, the level of that program is already laid out for years to come in existing legislation. The modest supplement provided by this bill will not affect that program but will make it more efficient by encouraging balanced transportation systems. It comes as a surprise to many but the fact is that nearly half of the \$41 billion authorized for that program is being spent in urban areas and is contributing greatly to improving our cities.

In spite of the dramatic accomplishments under the highway program, our backlog of need and rising requirements still outrun our efforts. The strongest highway advocate would not throw all of our urban transit needs on the shoulders of that program. The American Municipal Association has estimated that if the five cities of New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland were to lose bus and rail commuter service, it would cost \$31 billion to build the highways necessary to serve a comparable number of people. Testimony showed that if mass transportation were abandoned in Chicago alone, an additional 160 expressway lanes would be required plus parking facilities for 600,000 additional automobiles. Obviously,

the problems of traffic control would be monumental and the people of Chicago would spend a major part of their time and effort and a substantial part of their incomes on local transportation. In another city, Atlanta, it has been estimated that one expressway alone would need to have 36 lanes to handle the predicted 1970 traffic.

Overreliance on private automobiles also entails a heavy cost to the local taxpayer in the form of land removed from the tax rolls altogether or put to relatively low yielding purposes. Right now, more than one-half of downtown Los Angeles is devoted to moving or storing automobiles.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it perfectly clear that there is nothing in this bill which favors public ownership of mass transit over private enterprise. This has been emphasized in Presidential messages and in administration testimony, and we have guarded the rights of private enterprise closely in committee action on the bill. H.R. 3881 is supported by the American Transit Association representing the major private bus operators and by the Association of American Railroads. While the grant assistance naturally must go to a local public body, the equipment and facilities provided would normally be leased to private operators. This is just the way that the local authority in Philadelphia, which has pioneered in this field, now operates. In my judgment, this program will actually save many private companies. The financial difficulties of local bus and commuter train operators have forced many of them into the position where it was no longer profitable to operate and the city has been forced to take over just to continue service. By providing new equipment and better facilities to the private operators, we can increase their revenues and shore up their finances and thereby enable them to stay in business. Such aid is amply justified because of the public utility nature of mass transit. These companies provide a vital service which would have to be undertaken by local government if existing companies were not in business. Moreover, private companies are generally required to maintain noneconomic runs and services such as late night and weekend runs which do not fully pay their own way but are necessary to fulfill their public service. These companies are regulated as to return on investment by local authorities so that there would be no windfall to the private operators, only a justified return.

I would also like to emphasize that this program depends entirely upon local initiative, planning, and financial participation. It is entirely up to the people of a community whether or not they want to use the program and are willing to put up the local cash grant.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to quote from a speech given by President Johnson last week on mass transit:

Our Urban Mass Transportation Act sponsored by this administration has already passed the Senate of the United States and it will soon come to a vote in the House. We are going to do our dead level best to see that it passes the House and becomes the law of the land. Both Republicans and

Democrats are supporting that measure because transportation is a bipartisan problem. It is also national in scope.

Congress has voted billions of dollars to build highways, to build airports, to dredge harbors, to dredge canals, to improve river navigation. In the last century Congress helped finance railroads and shipping lines, to open up new areas of the country, to open up new trade routes abroad. Now Congress and the Federal Government must help to solve the problems of transportation.

The President went on to say:

When this bill went before one of the committees of Congress last year, a distinguished Republican Congressman from Ohio said to Congressman PATMAN, from my State, who was testifying in favor of the bill, "Why are you from Texas interested in helping the people of New York solve their traffic problems?" And the Congressman from my State said, "Well, I am interested because this is the United States of America, and the people of my State are as involved with the people of New York and California as the people of New York and California must be with the people of Texas."

Mr. Chairman, this bill has support on both sides of the aisle; it has support from private industry, labor, and local government; the need for it is clearly proven. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3881.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to my distinguished friend from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. It seems, from what my good friend has said, that first there is indicated an ability of the municipal governments to borrow, which is precisely what I said on the floor earlier. They have had success in their borrowings.

Despite all of my searching, I have not been able to find one city all the way across America which has had a bit of trouble in borrowing, and at a much smaller interest rate, for financing improvements in transit systems, or any other sort of capital structure.

I know that my good friend from Alabama would not wish to leave the impression here this afternoon that the cities of America are not able to borrow at interest rates almost 1 percent less than the Federal Government has to pay.

Let me say today that the gentleman knows as well as I that this program, if it goes through today, will have to be paid for with borrowed money, borrowed by the Federal Government at interest rates of more than 4 percent, when the cities are able to borrow money at 3 percent.

Mr. RAINS. If the gentleman heard a single, solitary mayor who appeared before the committee who said that they were able to do this out of their funds, he heard someone I did not hear.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. I would cite to the gentleman the case of New York City and the case of San Francisco.

I say to the gentleman, as one who served as a mayor formerly, as one who attended the meetings of the American Municipal Association and took part in the discussions, I do not believe there is a single mayor who has said, "We do not want Federal funds." That is the easy way out.

Mr. RAINS. That sounds good, but that is not the way it is, as the gentleman knows.

The gentleman knows that if we should follow that policy to the end, the thing to do would be to let the urban renewal program be handled locally. I believe the gentleman believes that. Then we would have to say, "Build your own highways. Keep the money you pay in taxes. Stop it at the city line, and do everything you want."

We cannot do that in this country. The people of the cities in this country—mine and yours—are entitled to a return of part of the taxes they pay, for what I believe is a very great need.

Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

While I sat in the Chamber listening to the debate, I looked up and saw something written by a good conservative which is on the wall above the Speaker's chair. This is what Daniel Webster said:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

I do not believe he was merely talking about farmland. I believe sincerely that this will be a good investment for the people of America. I believe it will be a good investment for private enterprise. I believe it will be a good investment for the taxpayers of this country. It may help to save the cities of our Nation. Thank you.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 3881.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3881, the urban mass transportation bill, is a must for the Philadelphia region, as it is for all our cities. In testifying on the bill last year Mayor Tate of Philadelphia, representing the U.S. Conference of Mayors, said:

The problem of public transportation is one of the toughest—if not the toughest—problems facing municipal government of every size in America.

The mayor has been very close to this problem. He has been in the forefront of the great effort Philadelphia has been making to solve it for more than 10 years. From this experience he speaks with authority as to the great need for the Federal Government to join in the effort to preserve and improve our cities' transportation systems.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors has urged Federal legislation to preserve and improve public transportation at each of its past seven annual conferences.

The problem has been before the Congress since 1960. It has been studied at great length by many competent people in addition to our cities' mayors and other State and local officials. There is very little dissent from the view that participation by the Federal Government in solving the problem is vitally necessary. As the months and years pass without such action, the problem

grows in severity and the cost of meeting it will increase.

Urbanization in America is no recent development, but in recent years the pace has quickened. It is estimated that by 1980 about 79 million more people will be added to the urban population. With more people making more and longer trips it is apparent that much of the increased travel must be made by high-capacity public transportation.

Despite an urban population increase of 38 percent between 1950 and 1960 there was a 40-percent decline in transit riders for the same period. In the past 10 years, 199 transit systems have been abandoned. This loss of public transportation is not only economically wasteful but a hardship to many of our citizens. Consider the plight of the infirm, the aged, the youth, and especially the worker with transportation in cities having no public transportation or inadequate and undependable systems.

The present bill is consistent with past Federal policy. Federal assistance has been extended for highway construction, railroads, waterways and other maritime operations, airports, and airline operations at various times in the past. The recent biannual authorization of funds for our A-B-C highway systems recently passed this House without a dissenting vote. In relation to past assistance for other forms of transportation, the funds for this bill are indeed modest.

The Philadelphia area provides an excellent example of what intelligent leadership and public support can do to stimulate transit usage. I use Philadelphia as an example, although there are others of equal significance, because I am familiar with the problem and I know what has been done there. We have more than a quarter of a billion dollars invested in the city's transit system. We have a capital improvement program of over \$100 million to improve the rapid transit system and commuter rail facilities.

I think we have proved that more people will choose public transportation if the service is attractive. In 1958 we appropriated \$160,000 to assist the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Reading Co. in furnishing improved commuter service. This was the start of a continuing program for such service improvements. In 1961 the adjoining counties of Bucks, Chester, and Montgomery joined with Philadelphia in forming the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Compact. This agency sponsored a service improvement demonstration project with HHFA furnishing two-thirds of the net cost.

The service improvement project got underway late in 1962. Since then the increase in ridership on both the Pennsylvania and Reading lines has been remarkable. Despite the gains in patronage already achieved under the limited program, at the end of the first year of the demonstration one line showed a 41-percent increase over the preceding year and the other line an increase of 60 percent. In terms of reduction in new freeway requirements, downtown parking facilities, and traffic congestion, this program must be regarded as an excellent investment for the whole city, not just the transit riders.

The Federal demonstration grant assistance that Philadelphia received was a "one-shot" affair, for operating expenses. The Philadelphia area badly needs the capital grant assistance proposed in H.R. 3881. The city itself is already putting just about as much as it can of money and effort into mass transportation—indeed, considerably more than most cities. But Philadelphia badly needs rapid transit lines that cannot be financed out of the present mass transit program.

And the situation is far more complicated, and even more discouraging, if you consider the Philadelphia area as a whole. That involves about 5 counties, with about 250 local governments.

It is very difficult for them to raise any funds to contribute to an areawide mass transportation system, which is what the Philadelphia area urgently needs. Federal capital assistance for such a system is essential to give leadership and incentive to local efforts.

Without Federal participation in local capital improvement programs for public transportation, local efforts—in the Philadelphia area and elsewhere—will almost certainly be inadequate. Without help, our Nation's cities and suburbs just cannot provide the total investment required for a counterpart of our splendid interstate and urban highway programs. Local debt has increased at a rate 35 times that of the Federal Government and is still going up. The preservation of the economic vitality of our cities—so important to the economic welfare of our Nation—urgently requires and justifies Federal assistance for urban mass transportation improvements.

A final word—let us not be fooled by the false charges that Federal expenditures will curb local home rule power. To quote Mayor Tate again:

No one is more jealous of the prerogatives of local government than the Nation's mayors. No one can shout louder if our local interests are trampled on. You can be sure that we are capable of maintaining our local freedom.

Mr. Chairman, this vitally important bill, H.R. 3881, must be passed.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to fully support H.R. 3881, the measure introduced and explained to the House by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

I support this bill because of my great concern over the stifling of the great cities and great urban areas, and now some of the suburban areas of the United States. This is a matter not merely of concern to those immediate areas, but of concern also to the moving population of our United States. Today it certainly is a mobile population, which moves from State to State, both for business and recreational purposes.

It is not like it used to be where one led a sheltered life with respect to many of the things that took place within our economy, within our States, within our rural areas, and within our cities. Today, particularly in the field of transportation, it is necessary to have well coordinated, well planned, well maintained systems if we are to meet the growing needs of our country.

Mr. Chairman, this bill requires the appropriation over a period of 3 years of \$500 million. I know that there will be critics who will say that is only scratching the surface and that ultimate expenditures will run into the billions. This undoubtedly will be true. I would not attempt to deny that. However, I do think we should begin to attempt to meet the needs of our Nation and not say that we can eternally postpone doing anything except constructing new highways, looking for new rights-of-way, and providing parking places in the cities for those who are the country dwellers or the suburban dwellers. This will not solve the problem. There are too many areas that are being stagnated today and critically affected by what is taking place within our economy.

Like any other appropriation, this should be examined for the monetary request which is entailed. Such examination, however, should be made in the light of what we will have to spend if we fail to act as well as what we will spend if we do act. Today we are becoming rapidly an urban economy. It is not our central cities that are growing, however, but our suburbs. The two areas must be linked up if both are to prosper.

For the last half century we have had at every level of government and have spent at every level of government billions of dollars in facilitating the movement of our cars and buses and trucks in trade over wider and wider roads. These roads have become thoroughfares, the thoroughfares have become throughways, the throughways have become expressways. Now, there are some that point out that expressways, during rush hours at least, have become our biggest and longest parking lots. When those cars reach their central city destination, there is the unending struggle to park them.

With our population and car ownership on the increase, we have come to the time when we must face the fact that in urban areas we will shortly not have the room for these expressways turned parking lots. We all know that a single stalled car in seconds can produce a traffic snarl that will extend for miles. We know that in winter any road and its traffic is at the mercy of ice and snow and driver judgment. You also know what happens in periods of real emergency if there is no alternative means of transportation by way of railroads. Mass transit offers a better way of transportation.

I am not suggesting that we abandon the highways. Some people seem to feel those of us who favor this mass transit bill want to stop the Federal highway program, which has been of great benefit to the United States and which should be continued full tilt without any cut. We need that program, and it is my sincere hope that we will have more of them. I do think we need this alternative, and the alternative is in the mass transit bill.

The need will grow greater with the years, not less, and I challenge any Member of this body to say to the contrary.

We have mass transit today, not the kind we need but one without which our economy could not function. Shut down

the railroads of this Nation for 48 hours, and the truth of my statement will be quickly demonstrated. This happened in all of our lifetimes. We are in danger of having that happen not in 48 hours, which would shock us, but over a period of years. These years will not be many, but while they run we will always be nibbled to death if we do not pass the measure now before us.

We will also be faced with the prospect of spending 10 times as much for mass transit as we are now requesting in this bill.

The mass transit business today is not healthy; its service is not what it should be, nor are its facilities. They are, however, better than the cost which the public is presently paying in the farebox.

The public is paying far more for automotive transport and the means to make it go, but through car ownership this is not easily realized. We cannot, however, wait any longer for assistance to mass transit. We need to preserve it now.

If we do not, we are liable to lose skills and experience that we cannot hope to replace in any short period of time. Very probably, we will most need those skills at a time when we are least able to re-acquire them. I ask you to consider this question carefully. It is my considered opinion that the welfare of the Nation is riding on the outcome of the successful passage of this bill and that time will soon make that evident.

H.R. 3881 looks to the acquisition of facilities and equipment. It does not look to the subsidization of operating costs. And I would like to emphasize that, because some people have a misconception of this bill. It does not subsidize operating costs.

It concentrates on research and development which must be carried on by those already experienced in the field. This should insure us both better service and faster transportation. It contains provision for a relocation program which would insure that any family displaced would be adequately protected. The rights of employees, particularly those with long service, are also protected.

The House bill was reported from the Banking and Currency Committee on April 9, 1963. A different version of this bill, the differences to be noted below, passed the Senate on April 4, 1963. The bill was voted out of committee on the House side with bipartisan support. Major provisions are as follows:

The bill provides for grants and loans to States and local bodies and agencies for construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of facilities and equipment. Assistance cannot be used for operating subsidies. The Federal share is two-thirds of the net project cost, a figure determined by subtracting from the gross project cost that amount which can be paid by revenues from the system itself. The local one-third share must be in cash.

The bill provides for a requirement of a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation plan before assistance is provided. In emergency situations, where a plan is being formed, and where delay would threaten the continuation or provision of a system, grants or loans

may be given out, but only on a 50-percent basis. If the full-planning requirement was met in 3 years, an additional one-sixth of the net project cost would be provided by the Federal Government.

The bill provides for a research, development, and demonstration project program involving grants of \$30 million—\$10 million per year—out of the \$500 million 3-year program total. The two-thirds, one-third Federal-local share would be eliminated with the Federal Government paying the entire amount of gross project cost, except that the value of facilities and equipment remaining after the experiment would be considered in determining the actual cost.

The bill provides for relocation payments up to \$200 for families displaced, and \$3,000 for businesses for actual direct losses of property except goodwill or profit, and moving expenses. In the case of businesses, the total cost of certified moving expenses would be paid if higher than \$3,000.

The House bill provides for a limitation of 12½ percent of the funds to any one State. The Senate has approximately the same limitation, but provides for the possibility of 1 percent of the total amount—\$375 million—to each State in addition, the total additional contracts not to exceed 10 percent of the total amount. Where regional bodies were concerned, the limitation would not apply.

In both bills, "urban area" is defined as whatever municipality or built-up area would be suitable for a transportation system to serve commuters "or others" in the locality taking into consideration growth trends—all as determined by the HHFA Administrator.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is an extremely meritorious bill and that it warrants the full consideration of every Member of this Congress who is looking forward to the progress of the United States and its overall economy. I maintain, and I believe others do also, that this is not a sectional bill, although it is correct that some urban areas will undoubtedly first benefit as a result of its enactment to a greater extent than some other sections of the United States. However, I believe it is necessary for those benefits to be made available.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill and hope we may soon see this new program in action.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire as to the language of the bill starting on line 20, page 21, which reads as follows:

SEC. 8. In order to assure coordination of highway and railway and other mass transportation planning and development programs in urban areas, particularly with respect to the provision of mass transportation facilities in connection with federally assisted highways, the Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and programs and shall exchange information on proposed projects in urban areas.

My question, Mr. Chairman, is: Does section 8, as quoted, provide for use of federally aided freeway and bridge systems rights-of-way in our urban areas for rapid transit?

Mr. WIDNALL. My answer to the gentleman's question is that this bill is intended to encourage the joint use of bridges and other rights-of-way for rapid transit and for highways.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to comment that in order to meet the growing congestion problems of our urban areas by highways only, the drain on Federal highway funds will be increasingly great.

On the other hand, with balanced transportation under which rapid transit systems handle a larger share of the peak-hour commuter traffic in these urban areas, the cost of constructing highways in these areas could be substantially reduced.

As I am told, one of the shortcomings of the Federal highway plan or program is that there has been no provision requiring Federal highway engineers to plan for mass transportation on these highways.

In my district, for example, in Seattle there is a new freeway cut running the full length of Seattle without a plan for mass transportation and also a new bridge on the east, across Lake Washington, which is without this important facility. Another access bridge to the city across the lake is in the planning stage now.

I would certainly hope, and I believe I have the assurance of the gentleman from New Jersey that this is so—that section 8 authorizes the use of highways and bridges for joint automobile and railway traffic.

Mr. WIDNALL. I would like to further assure the gentleman that such joint use would not mean the siphoning off of highway funds for mass transit purposes. The mass transit portion of the facilities would be eligible for assistance under this program and would be considered separate and would not represent something that would be added to the Federal aid highway program.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. As I understood the gentleman, your answer to the gentleman from Washington was to the effect that these funds could not be used as a part and parcel of the Federal highway program; is that correct?

Mr. WIDNALL. Yes.

Mr. RAINS. If the gentleman will yield further, that is my understanding. Also, I wish to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey for a good speech and I want to also compliment him for his very diligent efforts in connection with the work which was done on this bill.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the

funds which will be provided under this bill could be used for the building of bridges?

Mr. WIDNALL. No; I did not say that, but in conjunction with existing Federal highway programs.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this bill, while coming to the floor for the first time, is not new to the committee or to the Congress. We have been introducing bills for this type of legislation for many years. During the last session of Congress it was my privilege to introduce the administration bill which was reported but, unfortunately, not acted upon. I am very happy that the bill before us now is authored and carries the name of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

I am sure you join me in my unhappiness in knowing this may be the last piece of legislation the distinguished gentleman from Alabama will have the opportunity of sponsoring on the floor of the House. I am happy this piece of legislation will bear his name, because when it is enacted it will go down as a memorial to one of the greatest statesmen that the Congress has ever produced. His absence in future sessions of the Congress will indeed be a great loss to us here, and to the country. His service has been unstinting, it has been unselfish; he has been loyal and patriotic to the highest extent. The best tribute that I think could be paid to him is to borrow some of his own language that he used on the floor today when he indicated it is the duty of a Member of Congress not only to represent his district, but to represent the entire country, and that ALBERT RAINS has done throughout his service in the Congress of the United States.

Again, I say I am sure that you all join me in indicating that while we recognize this great loss to the Congress and the country, we wish him well in his future undertakings.

Mr. Chairman, as to the bill itself, may I say that this represents bipartisanship at its best. I recognize that there will be some Members on both sides of the aisle who will be opposed to it. Certainly all of the members of the committee and the bipartisan support it has received in the committee indicate that this is a piece of legislation we would like to see enacted in the best interests, not of any one area of the country, but of the entire country, so that each section—farmer, industrialist, and urbanite—can work together to continue to perform in the best interest of all of us as Americans.

I have heard it said that this bill is the beginning of a multibillion-dollar program. I for one will not deny that. This is the beginning or the start of a good program, and while we are calling for a small sum, comparatively speaking, for the beginning of this program, if it works well, then I can assure you future Congresses will not hesitate to authorize and appropriate the billions of dollars that may be necessary for this program.

This program will supplement the highway program, without which the

country cannot survive and, as has been so well stated here, as you have already heard, our cities cannot survive without this mass transportation bill. If the cities cannot survive, the rural parts of the country cannot survive either. You may say they are not dependent on each other, but they are certainly interdependent. They do need one another, and they compliment and supplement each other, and it is that which will make our country great if we can continue to have them work together side by side.

I am not fearful, and I urge you not to be fearful, of the fact that some tremendous figures will be thrown at you by the opponents of this measure indicating this program is about to cost the country billions of dollars that our children and our children's children will be called upon to pay. Our children and our children's children and their great-grandchildren will benefit from this program when it is enacted, and if it succeeds in doing the things we hope it will. If it should fail in the experimental stages, then we need not go any further, and will call a halt, and that will be it, and we will look for other ways and means of accomplishing this needed program, the needed solution for these problems that are crying for solution.

If it does work, as I hope it will and as most of the people who testified in favor of the bill have indicated it will, I am sure we will go on with this program. I cannot recall any other bill coming to the floor of the House that had practically the unanimous support of business, of labor, of management, of mayors, public officials, and Governors of all political faiths. They came in in droves and testified during the last session of Congress in support of the bill, and they then came in or sent in statements or repeated their testimony before this committee in this session of Congress.

I have heard it said, too, that the localities can borrow this money at cheaper rates of interest with tax-exempt bonds than we can do the job if the Federal Government should give these grants as called for by this program, that because that money must come from the Federal Treasury, we will have to raise it by borrowing. To the extent that we raise it by borrowing, and to the extent that the interest rate on those Government bonds is higher than the low interest rate on tax-exempt bonds of municipalities and States, let me call your attention to the fact that by and large it is only the big income earners, corporate and individual, in the highest tax brackets who buy these Government bonds, with the result that if you take off the income tax return or payments made on those bonds, those bonds are costing the U.S. Government less than the tax-exempt bonds.

I urge the committee to favorably report this bill to the House.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LLOYD].

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill, not because I fail to recognize a problem and not because the problem

does not exist in my district. The problem does exist in my urban district where over 600,000 persons live along a narrow, hundred-mile strip, and I have been importuned by the private transit companies in this area to support this legislation. However, of significance is the answer to my inquiry to the mayor and city commissioners of our largest city, Salt Lake City, as to whether they wanted this legislation. They replied unanimously in the negative.

My opposition is based on the proposition that there are better, safer, and more reliable ways to cope with the problem, more consistent with the recognition of proper responsibilities by local and State government.

In pressing for reduction of the income tax, there were representations made by this administration that the reduction would be accompanied by conservative spending. Yet this bill, by authorizing the appropriation of a half billion dollars in grants opens the gate to a Federal financial obligation of from \$4 to \$6 billion, according to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in testimony before the Senate Committee, and in excess of \$8 billion according to the judgment of others, and which are cited in the minority report on the bill. Before the House committee, the Administrator merely said:

We cannot give you accurate figures on this now. We would be kidding you and kidding ourselves if we attempted it.

In other words, we are asked to go through a gate into darkness.

Unless we look upon greater Federal spending and greater Federal debt as a meritorious fact of life, we cannot look upon this spending authorization with anything but alarm. It opens up a vast new field of Federal service. It represents an outright grant. It is not repayable to the U.S. Treasury.

Second, the issue of increased centralism: The bill vests in the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration an authority, for example, in the establishment of criteria, which necessarily includes his approval of fares, which is a dramatic example of central power, and one which I as a citizen wishing to preserve local freedom and responsibility look upon with distaste and apprehension to say the least. It is stated that because Federal programs of urban renewal, public housing and the like have created a Federal responsibility within the core of a city, a responsibility of moving these populations within the city now becomes a Federal one. I agree that if the Central Government takes over this responsibility, it must be responsible also for the criteria, and since the drawing of criteria is principally an administrative function, this great authority must be given to an Administrator. So inevitably, step by step, the addition of this new Federal service must be accompanied by effective administrative power. This is efficiency. It is also centralism and if we add this authority to our Federal Government we must take the bad with the good. To me the bad outweighs the good.

I want to emphasize a third objection I have to the bill, not the last by any means, but the objection to which I would like to direct my principal emphasis. This is the establishment of a direct financial tie, undoubtedly a permanent one, between our local governments and our Federal Government, thereby bypassing State government. Unlike the highway program which involves State funds and which is State administered on the basis of decisions made at the State level, this legislation would eliminate the State as a responsible party. I recognize that language in the bill refers to the fact that the Federal agency may contract through a State authority, but this is principally lipservice. There is absolutely no responsibility placed upon the State. The local governments are invited to come to Washington directly, and who can doubt that local government will shun the State as a plague which can only get in the way of more expeditious charity from Washington?

I believe the relationship between State government and local government to be fundamental to the continuance of democratic government as we know it. In most States, local government is authorized to tax only by those methods allowed by the State. School districts, after exhausting local remedies for financing, turn to State government to help in equalizing educational opportunity throughout the State. Even Federal programs, such as public welfare, workmen's compensation, library services, mental health services, the highway programs, to name but a few, operate through State government.

In questioning the mayor of Boston who appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee to testify in favor of this legislation, I asked the question as to whether the cities in that State had been authorized to levy a local sales tax. He replied that the attempt had been made by the cities, but that the measure had failed by one vote in the legislature of that State. So rather than going back to try again, he came to Washington.

In my view, the cities should go to their State legislature and ask either for local means of financing mass transit or for the State itself to assume responsibility. As a matter of fact, the State of Massachusetts has done just that, this month. The State legislature has authorized a \$225 million bond issue to finance a comprehensive urban transit plan to be financed by an additional cigarette tax showing that the State will act. If the Federal Government undertakes this responsibility, how can we ever expect local and State governments to discharge local responsibility?

What is the role of the State? No one could have put it better than the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a permanent bipartisan body set up by act of Congress in 1959 to give continuing study to the relationships among local, State, and national levels of government. Its membership is drawn from all three levels of government.

In its report entitled, "State Legislative Program of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations,"

dated October 1963, the Commission stated:

The States have a traditional responsibility for assuring that adequate arrangements exist for the provision of basic local governmental services, including adequate mass transportation. The States have an important stake in, and can play a key role in meeting existing and emerging metropolitan mass transportation needs. State policies with respect to taxation of transportation properties and the regulation of transportation rates and service have an important bearing upon the ability of private and public enterprise to provide adequate mass transportation service to metropolitan area residents. The State government is in a strong position to help resolve problems among conflicting local jurisdictions in providing coordinated mass transportation facilities and supporting adequate transportation planning on an areawide basis.

The report of the Banking and Currency Committee majority contains the following statement which calls for comment:

The financial difficulties of the State and local governments are even more acute than the jurisdictional difficulties. Many of our cities are faced with rising service costs and declining tax bases.

The disquieting factor about that statement is the intimation that if a local government is inadequately financed, it becomes the duty of the Federal Government to step in and take over what has in the past been the responsibility of local government. The question may be asked at this point whether the problem of crime is any less than the problem of adequate transportation within the city. Many would say that the problem of crime is the greater problem with greater interstate effect and since some cities can prove a case of financial need, should not it then be proper for the Federal Government to step in and finance and establish criteria for crime prevention and detection? It could be shown, for instance, that here in the District of Columbia, under Federal financing, there are about 4.5 police employees per 1,000 population, whereas under local government financing there is a national average of only 2.6 per 1,000 in cities of more than a quarter million.

To conclude, I repeat there is a problem, but it is a local one. We are asked to make a judgment that local government is incapable of solving this problem alone. The example of San Francisco and other cities argues against our making this final judgment. But if, as a last resort, the Federal Government should become a party to this responsibility, it should do so only on a basis which recognizes State government as the administrative and regulatory authority, through which any Federal funds should be channeled, and from which Federal funds should be at least substantially returned in due course to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of H.R. 3881—a bill designed to assist State and local agencies, not only in planning mass transportation facilities and developing improved equipment, techniques, and methods but also

in financing areawide coordinated systems by means of grants and loans.

There should be no doubt in the minds of anyone that the continued growth of the national economy is dependent upon adequate transportation in metropolitan areas.

Transportation is the most important single factor determining the nature of future urban areas. Mass transportation is the key to other forms of transportation. However, all methods and modes of transportation must be coordinated into an overall system if our metropolitan areas are to continue to progress.

Transportation systems must be planned within the framework of all other urban planning and programing. Transportation must be an integral part of comprehensive land use and community development for entire urban areas—whether they encompass few or many political subdivisions and jurisdictions.

The Federal obligation to assist State and local bodies is evidenced by many other programs such as urban renewal.

The Bureau of Public Roads cooperates informally with other agencies concerned with urban planning in the location of new or improved urban highways under the Federal aid highway program. Without such aid many communities would have been unable to finance these activities.

But highways are only one of the necessary components of an adequate transportation system and plans and programs must be evolved to develop a balanced transportation system consistent with the present needs and future development of the economy.

This bill, H.R. 3881, Mr. Chairman, will contribute toward resolving many of the most important transportation problems in the metropolitan areas. Its purpose is not to take over the responsibility of the State and local agencies but to supplement their efforts. Historically the Federal Government has aided and encouraged all forms of public transportation from the early days of this Nation.

This bill would extend financial aid to the efforts of State and local agencies in planning the equally important mass transportation facilities in metropolitan areas.

As we become more and more a Nation of urban dwellers, the role of transportation becomes increasingly important.

Traffic congestion is not only the concern of the people in the congested areas but also a national concern. Problems which affect the welfare of some two-thirds of our population must be the concern of the Federal Government.

In many of the metropolitan areas mass transportation service has declined or disappeared. At the same time the population has grown and become more widely dispersed away from the central cities, creating the need for increased mass transportation facilities. Meanwhile the remaining facilities have been deteriorating and service becoming less adequate, resulting in still less use of public transportation.

Diminished financial resources have resulted in poor service and inadequate equipment. State and local governments

are hampered in efforts to solve this problem by constitutional debt limits and diversity of political jurisdictions.

Federal cooperation is needed to help solve problems which cross political and geographic boundaries. We do have metropolitan areas but no metropolitan governments.

This serious problem is not confined to the large metropolitan areas such as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and others, but it faces smaller communities and cities as well.

It has been reported that over 70 cities with populations of 25,000 and over are without any mass transportation service. This bill would help these less publicized communities as well as the larger, more publicized cities.

As urban population grows, each and every mode of transportation will be needed to facilitate the movements of people and goods. Mass transportation must provide superior service to gain increased patronage.

The highway programs, the urban renewal projects, and all urban planning assistance programs will become more effective with the passage of this bill.

Despite the existence of one of the most highly developed and diversified transportation systems in the world, public transportation in the United States has not kept pace with the growth and increasing needs of urban areas.

The metropolitan areas are the backbone of our national strength. Their continued growth and consequent contribution to the national economy depend on adequate transportation systems within the areas as well as between them.

Before concluding, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members the deep concern of the executive director of the Port Authority of New York. At a recent conference of urban transportation, Mr. Austin Tobin, the director, reiterated the inability of States and cities to underwrite the capital requirements of mass transportation facilities, though they can underwrite operating deficits. Equipment needs exceed their financial resources and they "have a right to expect the Federal Government to be as interested in moving city workers as in shipping wheat and rock phosphate down the Arkansas River."

I firmly believe that the provisions of this bill are the best and most practical way in which we can help solve this mass transportation problem in this country.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, H.R. 3881 is one of the most vital and most urgent matters that we can consider. As we all realize, the breakdown of transit facilities in our urban centers directly affects the livelihood of not only urban dwellers but the Nation as a whole. Representing, as I do, one of the Nation's great cities, I appreciate the far-reaching impact that an urban area has upon its surroundings. It may be the headquarters of major technical and industrial corporations, the hub of nationwide rail transport, the

center of foreign and domestic commerce or the financial capital of the region. Rural and suburban interests as well as our total national economic effort depend upon the vitality and efficiency of our urban centers, and yet it now appears that our cities face unwelcome social and economic restraints from overburdened transportation networks. Each year urban population increase continues to outstrip adequate transit facilities, forcing passengers to switch to auto transportation which in turn has led to costly, time-consuming traffic congestions and increased air pollution in our cities. With blockage of major supply lines and decreased mobility, our urban areas are being threatened by a strangulation that impairs not only urban activity but every segment of our economy. When we consider that the United States is becoming increasingly urban in character and activity, that many of our metropolitan areas already cross State boundaries and that the welfare of all our citizens depends upon the progress of our cities, I cannot see how the problem of urban transportation can be considered anything less than national in character.

I also understand that urban mass transit constitutes an area in which each dollar of Federal assistance will yield several dollars in savings and benefits. Our studies in the San Francisco Bay area shows conclusively that we spend less money and get greater benefits if we support the development of comprehensive metropolitan transit systems. San Francisco and similar metropolitan areas throughout the Nation will be better able to plan more consolidated and efficient transit programs if Federal assistance is made available under this act.

I do not in any way wish to disparage State and local efforts in meeting urban transit problems. I can only point with pride at the great strides being made in San Francisco by the local bay area rapid transit district. But even in this progressive metropolis, Federal funds would generate an estimated \$50 million a year in measurable benefits for riders of the system by making completion of our network 3½ years sooner and would make feasible extending the benefits of rapid transit to those two bay counties which were initially unable to join our system due to problems of financing. I am convinced that other urban areas which have either begun transit improvements or plan such improvements would also benefit in time and savings through Federal assistance.

I clearly recognize that this legislation cannot provide for our present and future transportation needs without an initial increase in Federal expenditure. But I firmly believe that Federal funds allocated for comprehensive urban transit systems would save money in the long run if these urban areas can avoid additional massive and costly freeway construction under the Federal highway aid program.

Many of our urban centers attempt to avoid the dilemma of mass congestion by constructing complex and expensive freeway systems which only tend to attract more automobiles and drain local rev-

enues that could be used for transit improvements. The projections of future population growth point to the inescapable conclusion that there simply is not enough ground space to accommodate the freeways nor the parking areas required in the next two decades and yet have enough left over for the vital space requirements of industry and urban dwellers. As a matter of fact, the citizens and officials of San Francisco have over the past years resolutely refused to accept any new freeway construction because of the vast amounts of land they would require, the municipal disruption they would cause, and the prohibitive expense they would incur, hoping as they do that improved mass transit facilities will largely supplant the need for freeways.

As all of you know, my own State of California has been in the forefront in construction of freeways in and out of metropolitan areas, and yet from personal observation and through my dealings with our State's program during the time I served as secretary to the Governor of California, I have seen freeways become obsolete before completion, and I have become quite certain that a total reliance upon freeways as an alternative to mass transit improvements can never be an adequate solution to mass congestion in our urban areas. This raises a very disturbing thought: in the next few decades, the Government plans to spend billions of dollars on the construction of urban highway systems that will only serve to further complicate, rather than to solve, urban transportation problems. I believe that if Federal funds are going to be spent on urban transportation, investment in mass transit improvements will be far more economical and beneficial than investment in freeways.

The cost of inaction increases as we delay passage of mass transit measures. Since 1957 I have been urging the Congress to give its attention to urban transit problems: during these years we have seen the localities struggle to retain present transit facilities while failing to provide for future transit needs, many communities have been forced to undertake costly and uncoordinated freeway systems, we have felt the ill effects of air pollution and traffic congestion in our cities. Superior mass transit systems are needed to work with existing freeways to alleviate our present and future transportation problems. We have in H.R. 3881 the means to attain this objective and the responsibility to insure its achievement. I urge your support of this measure.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Chairman, to grasp the compelling need for this legislation one has only to drive along the so-called freeways or expressways leading to and from our major cities and experience one of the monumental traffic jams which has become a distinguishing feature of life in America today. If that is not enough, one has only to ride the commuter trains such as the New Haven Railroad, which serves my district.

Either experience will drive home indelibly the fact that our national transportation facilities are in terrible condition and are deteriorating rapidly—so rapidly that they may be beyond restoration if we, in Congress, do not take action.

Our existing facilities are irreplaceable. They are assets vital both to the national defense and the national economy. They must be preserved as foundations on which to build.

This is truly a national problem, not merely a regional one.

It is estimated that it would cost more than \$30 billion to provide highways to move the same number of people now being carried by railroads into just the five cities of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, and Cleveland.

Today, 70 percent of the population lives in 170 metropolitan centers. In another 10 years or so, it is expected that 80 percent of our people will live in these areas. Clearly, everyone in the country is directly affected by mass transportation problems. Even the farmer living in the most remote section of the country is directly concerned, because if railroads continue to lose millions of dollars in metropolitan commuter operations, as they are now doing, freight revenues will have to go up to recoup these losses. This will affect and does now affect the price of every commodity and manufactured article used in the economy. If mass transportation services are allowed to collapse or, even if we do not act to enlarge them to meet our future needs, the funds necessary to move people by highways will soar beyond the financial capacity of the Nation.

These grave problems cannot be solved on a solely local and regional basis. A large part of the problem is that the metropolitan areas in most cases stretch across local and State boundaries. There are simply no central jurisdictions with authority to plan and provide facilities even if they had the tax resources to do it.

The problem is of supreme importance to my area. Yet, there is no central agency that can deal with the commuter problem and the New Haven Railroad. Connecticut has extended tax relief and other assistance but the railroad is bankrupt and losing money. It can raise its rates no more. Its equipment is wearing out; its services are being cut back.

While our situation is particularly acute, it is duplicated with local variations elsewhere in the country.

This bill will not solve all of these problems but it will provide, for the first time, a basis for Federal, State, and local cooperation. It is an essential first step. I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes at this time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, House passage of the pending legislation, the mass transportation bill, is vitally important to the State of New Jersey and to every State which contains within its boundaries a metropolitan area of growing population—and this includes most of our 50 States. As a sponsor of mass transit and related legislation for the past 7 years, I have seen a growing realization among our colleagues that this is

a national problem of immense and almost unpredictable consequences, and I urge this House to begin the work of solving it without further dangerous delay.

In determining the nature and scope of Federal responsibility for mass transportation, the key consideration, it seems to me, is the fact that improved mass transit facilities in our country's heavily populated urban areas promises better service, lower cost, more economical use of scarce land, and higher property values and tax revenues than we are now obtaining from our existing policy of excessive reliance on automotive transportation.

No one questions any more the basic responsibility of the Federal Government for maintaining an adequate national transportation system. We simply cannot exist without it. In recognition of this fact, the Government heavily subsidizes air transportation and highway construction, for example, and closely regulates all forms of interstate transportation. Although I do not dispute the need for such subsidy and regulation, a direct result has been to unbalance severely the transportation system generally. We have succeeded in dramatically increasing the speed of travel between cities by air and by turnpike, superhighway, and freeway, but as often as not once the traveler reaches the airport or the outskirts of a major urban area he is unmercifully dumped into a morass of bumper-to-bumper traffic.

Today, a person can drive from Washington to New York City during the off hours in 3½ hours, thanks to the hundreds of millions of dollars of superhighway construction in recent years. But during the rush hours, that last half-hour can stretch into a maddening hour and a half to 2 hours, virtually destroying much of the benefit of the new speedways. Likewise, the flying time from Washington to New York is less than 1 hour, but the trip from the airport to the city can take twice that length of time.

This is the price of the unbalanced transportation system we have built. It is even more serious for the millions of commuters between suburb and central city whose entire travel time to and from work is spent under these unnerving conditions. Most of us, I feel certain, have experienced personally the harrowing effects of mammoth traffic jams, but for those who need convincing I recommend a helicopter flight over a major metropolitan area during the time commuters are driving to or returning from work. Earlier this year, I made such a survey by helicopter of the principal highways in the Newark and Union County, N.J. area used by commuters. The picture of thousands upon thousands of automobiles creeping and crawling along broad highways which became outmoded almost as soon as they were completed is, I can report, dramatically persuasive of the urgency of the commuter traffic problem.

The details of the problem may differ somewhat from one metropolitan area to another, but the substance and seriousness are the same everywhere. In the New York area alone, one-tenth of the

Nation is involved. But, as our committee hearings demonstrated, the situation is just as urgent in Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Chicago, Atlanta, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and many other areas. More important, every month that passes makes the problem worse and more expensive to solve. That this is a national problem should be clear from its size and scope alone and from the fact that there is no essential difference between building Federal highways in urban areas and supporting mass transit systems located in the same areas and serving the same people.

The challenge which now confronts the House, Mr. Chairman, is to break the vicious cycle which clogs the highways with more and more unnecessary automobiles at peak traffic hours and drains the bus and rail facilities of the passengers they need to maintain and improve the quantity, convenience, and quality of their mass transit services. The passengers would not return until more service is provided in better facilities at lower cost. Commuter railroads and buslines cannot provide improved service without higher revenues, either from paying passengers or public subsidies, or both. In the meantime, buslines go out of business, railroads abandon commuter trains, and the demand gets louder for more and bigger highways to rescue traffic-jammed drivers.

My own State of New Jersey, which is probably as heavily dependent on adequate passenger transportation of all kinds as any State in the Nation, illustrates this situation all too readily. An estimated 150,000 New Jersey people commute to and from New York daily—90,000 in the 1-hour period from 8 to 9 a.m., 50,000 by highway and 40,000 by rail. In just 1 county, the county I represent in Congress, approximately 60,000 people go out of the county to work and an equal number come in to the county to work from adjoining areas. Yet, in the face of this huge demand for transportation service, and of a rapidly growing population, rail and bus facilities have decreased while fares have increased. No less than 24 percent of railroad passenger trains have been discontinued in the last 10 years. And the threat of further major discontinuances hangs over our State at this very time.

The question we must answer is not whether we can afford the cost of a mass transportation program but whether we can afford not to undertake such a program. People and goods have to be moved—one way or another. And there is no longer any doubt that it costs a great deal less to move people by mass transit than it does by highway. This is not to say that highways are not necessary or that more highways will not have to be built in any event simply to keep up with the growing population and economy. But it does mean this: on the one hand, improved mass transportation can ease the strain on existing and future highway needs and, on the other, failure to halt the loss of mass transit facilities will vastly increase the need and the cost of new highways, assuming we can find the space and the money and overcome the resistance to build them.

These generalizations can easily be documented. In Washington, D.C., for instance, one study concluded that each new suburban resident who chooses to drive his car to work in the city requires an added public investment of \$23,000 above the cost of express bus service, plus an extra \$9 a day to service the debt from this investment.

As our committee report shows, for another example, it would cost \$31 billion to build the highways needed to accommodate only those passengers now being carried by rail in the five cities of New York, Chicago, Boston, Cleveland, and Philadelphia.

More specifically, a 1959 study by the Pennsylvania Railroad compared the construction costs necessary to handle increased peak-hour loads by rail or by automobile from the suburbs served by this one railroad in the Philadelphia and New York metropolitan areas. In Philadelphia, the ratio was seven to one in favor of rail; \$465 million to provide additional rail facilities to handle 120,000 passengers per hour as opposed to more than \$3 billion for an equivalent capacity by automobile. In New York, the ratio was even higher, 16 to 1: new rail facilities to carry 80,000 passengers an hour would cost \$748 million, while new highway facilities would cost \$7.8 billion.

These examples can be multiplied indefinitely, Mr. Chairman. They demonstrate conclusively that mass transportation is the only alternative, the only way out of our dilemma. We have neither the space nor the money to continue to rely on the private automobile for a growing share of transportation service in urban areas. The steady shift of our population to urban areas—and more than two-thirds of our people already live in these areas—is increasing. And since 1958, the number of persons annually reaching the age of 18—the age when most people begin to drive and obtain their own cars—has been rising at record speed as a result of the extraordinarily high birth rates of the 1940's. The data on government expenditures for streets and highways, reflect these trends. From 1949 to 1959, annual expenditures rose from \$3.9 to \$10.5 billion, a rate of increase about 2½ times as great as the increase in national income during that period. Obviously, we cannot continue to spend on highways at this bankrupting rate. And the complaints from State after State that they cannot keep up with their highway needs testify that we have reached the limit.

Fortunately, mass transportation on a much larger scale than we have ever known it is not only the sole alternative to traffic strangulation, but it is a positive, practical, and proven alternative. We have the technology to produce the fast and comfortable transit cars and buses and related facilities. We have the advanced planning necessary to build truly integrated, coordinated, and well-balanced rail-highway transportation systems. And we have the incentive to implement this potential, if we will only recognize it, in the lower costs, greater efficiency, and overall increased convenience of mass transportation.

The city of Toronto, Canada's second largest with 2 million people living in the metropolitan area, and a city comparable in its transportation needs to many in the United States, illustrates the truth of the claims for mass transit. About 800,000 people commute daily to the central city where, 10 years ago, according to U.S. News & World Report, auto travel was "a nightmare of creeping motion, punctuated by stops, starts, and stalls."

In the past 10 years, however, Toronto has built a 6½-mile-long subway under the heart of the city which is the core of a fully integrated bus-streetcar-subway system. Subway trains alone carry 250,000 passengers daily and have eliminated from 10,000 to 25,000 automobiles on downtown streets every working day. To move these subway riders in private autos, officials figure that at least 20 lanes of expressways would be needed through downtown Toronto.

The results have been spectacular. Traffic now moves freely for those who need or want to drive their cars, but the transit system has proved cheaper, faster, safer, and more convenient than driving. The subway has also revived the midtown area, setting off a boom in new office and apartment building, greatly increasing property values, and adding to the tax base to such an extent that the new tax revenues from the area of the subway route are sufficient to equal both the capital outlays and the carrying charges for the initial subway system. The system has been so successful, in fact, that Toronto plans to extend it from 6.5 miles to 20 miles soon and by 1980 double it to 40 miles.

In Chicago, an abandoned transit line was reactivated on the basis of improved service coordinated with parking and feeder-bus facilities. Estimates in advance of the program indicated the project might double the number of riders from approximately 750 a day before abandonment to as many as 1,550. In fact, however, the line is now carrying 5,000 passengers daily and plans to double its schedule of service.

More modest demonstration projects in the New York-New Jersey area, which are still in operation, are demonstrating impressively that improved feeder bus service, more ample parking, and the provision of specialized and well-equipped commuter passenger station service will substantially increase rail commuter transportation between suburbs and central cities.

The evidence of what needs to be done and what can be done with mass transportation is abundant, Mr. Chairman.

In Massachusetts, the Governor has just signed legislation creating a transit authority for Boston and its 77 suburbs and authorizing the expenditure of \$255 million for planning and building a commuter transportation system.

And in my own New Jersey, Mr. Chairman, where the State government has been subsidizing the continuation of rail commuter service, the Governor has signed legislation increasing the subsidy and providing funds for a substantial rerouting of rail service to New York.

These are only a handful of examples of the needs and opportunities for sav-

ing or building sound passenger transportation facilities in those areas of the country where most of our people choose to live. Many of the States are making truly valiant efforts to stay ahead of the tide of people and cars. But all of the States which are in this predicament have been frank to seek the partnership of the Federal Government. They do not expect the Federal Government to take over their responsibilities. But they do look for help—the marginal kind of help that can make the difference between success and defeat for their efforts.

I hope the House will respond to their pleas for help. If we are genuinely interested in economic progress and in serving the people we represent, then we shall do so and approve this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to pass this much-needed legislation.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I was most interested in the remarks of my colleague, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], who just preceded me.

Every Member of this House has been terribly inconvenienced, to say the least, by the congestion and strangulation of traffic in our cities. Each one of us, every night, experiences unconscionable delays in going just a few miles to our homes or apartments. This sort of thing happens every morning and every evening in every major city in the Nation, and in frequent other periods during the day and at night. Traffic moves at a snail's pace, tempers fray, motors overheat, people wilt, drivers become impatient and take chances and risk accidents, and all too often strike pedestrians while trying to get through intersections while the lights are changing. I suppose the National Institutes of Health could do a revealing study on how many heart attacks, along with accident injuries, can be attributed to the impossible conditions under which people get to and from work each day, or to and from the theater, or meetings, or other events at night. Why do we put up with it?

Passage of this bill—a bill carefully and thoroughly considered in the Committee on Banking and Currency in several Congresses and now shaped into a form which will make it acceptable as well as practical—passage of this bill will not automatically mean the end of traffic strangulation in our cities. It will be a major weapon in fighting urban mass immobility, but it will not solve the problem alone. On the other hand, the problem will never be solved without this kind of beginning.

Some Members may say with all candor that in their less crowded areas of the country, mass transportation is not serious enough a problem to justify this kind of an all-out attack. Perhaps that is so at the moment—but as Congressman RAINS has said to you, also, that does not absolve any Member from the responsibility of having an interest in the solution of the problems all of our major cities are struggling to solve in the movement of people to and from the center of town. If their towns are

placid and uncrowded now, the chances are, with the tremendous growth in population, and the spread of industry into new areas, and the development of all of our communities, the problems of mass transportation now experienced by St. Louis and other cities will also be coming to roost soon in smaller cities and towns.

SMALLER COMMUNITIES NOW BENEFITING FROM PREVIOUS "BIG-CITY" LEGISLATION

I would say to those Members, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that if it is not their immediate problem now, it will be—unless they help us solve our urgent problems of urban transportation. Many Members once thought urban renewal and slum clearance programs were useful only to big cities; now they find their own districts deeply involved and needing help. They should therefore be glad that the urban area Members led the fight here in previous years to set up the programs that now mean rebirth and new life for many smaller communities which were dying in blight.

Most American families are travel conscious, and anxious to see the great country of which they are a part. We have the magnificent Interstate Highway System to help them speed from one part of the Nation to another. But much of the greatness of our country is in our great cities, and when citizens from the rural and small town areas come to the big cities—as they do in increasing numbers—they experience what those of us who live in those cities must undergo every day in getting into and out of the center of town. I have spent hours in trying to persuade Members from districts which do not include large cities that they should vote for this bill because it is not only good for our cities—it is good for America. We are all part of one vast and wonderful country. We all have obligations to the entire country—to help make it into a better America. One of the urgent needs in that direction is better urban transportation, and this bill is necessary to provide it.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Moss). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Thirty-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 166]

Ashbrook	Hansen	Pilcher
Auchincloss	Harsha	Powell
Avery	Healey	Quile
Barrett	Hébert	Randall
Bass	Hoffman	Rogers, Tex.
Bennett, Mich.	Hollifield	Roosevelt
Bow	Ichord	Schadeberg
Bray	Kee	Scott
Buckley	Kilburn	Senner
Cameron	Kilgore	Springer
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Staggers
Evins	Lankford	Toll
Forrester	Long, La.	Tuten
Green, Oreg.	Miller, N.Y.	Willis
Hall	Morrison	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. Moss, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 3881, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 390 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is responsible legislation because it is responsive to changes which are transforming the face of our Nation and the living patterns not only of this generation but of generations to come.

The minority report suggests that the need for mass transportation facilities is limited and that to the extent that a problem exists, it is simply a local one which can be met by local initiative.

I submit the facts are very much to the contrary and that the need for mass transit is probably the most overlooked and neglected problem in America today. The reason for this, I believe, is to be found in the tremendous emphasis that has been put on investment in highways, freeways and urban expressways since World War II and in the increased ownership and use of automobiles. Since the end of World War II, Mr. Chairman, State and Federal Governments have invested nearly \$130 billion in highway construction and the number of automobiles skyrocketed from 30 million in 1946 to 83 million at the end of 1963. Small wonder that this upsurge in private conveyance has been accompanied by elimination of many transit systems and the doubling of others caught in the squeeze between higher costs and lower revenues.

And yet it is plain that private automobiles are not the answer to the transportation problem in the cities today—just as it is plain that more cars and more expressways will not be the answer 10 years from now—or in 40 years when our population has doubled.

In the immediate years ahead, three out of four Americans will be living in urban centers which occupy only 2 percent of our Nation's land area. Clearly there is a need for mass transportation and it is just as clear that this need is not local in character. It affects directly our national welfare because it affects the health and safety of most Americans, the way we live and the way we work.

Mr. Chairman, our transit systems today are not meeting our needs and the testimony of scores of public officials who testified on this bill establishes the fact that the capital investment necessary to develop efficient transit systems is beyond the resources of most communities. In 1961 Congress acted to meet this problem but the tools that were made available then simply have not been sufficient to get the job done or even well underway. The loan and demonstration grant authority contained in the Housing Act of 1961 was

only intended as a stopgap measure, with emphasis on experimentation. This is no longer enough. We now need a long-range program of loans and grants for efficient, carefully planned transit systems capable of playing a major role in the movement of the increasing numbers of citizens whose lives will be spent in our growing metropolitan areas.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished Member who just preceded me, the gentleman from Toledo, indicated that the minority report advocated a limited approach to mass transportation. Contrariwise, I would suggest to him that the limited approach is the Federal approach, because it is limited by the amount of Federal appropriations from year to year. Instead of that, if the problem is handled on a local level it will be handled as the need demands.

I think a real answer and example of that is one that was brought out by a statement of the gentleman from Alabama when he stated that all the mayors who testified before our committee were for this program. You bet they were. And let us take an example of two of them. A group came in from San Francisco. What was their situation? They had a bond issue passed, and a plan which was ready to be carried out. Why did they want Federal help? Oh, yes, they said it would help them move forward faster. But they asked for Federal help, not to add to the transportation plan they were going to put in effect but rather to cut the local taxes which the local taxpayers had agreed to by an overwhelming vote.

Let us take my own city of Cleveland. Here we have an extension of the mass transit system approved by the bondholders, approved by a transit board 3 to 2. After that approval, 2 weeks later, it was suddenly reversed, and two of the majority changed their position. Why? Because there is the hint of Federal assistance coming along, with the result that the transit system extension in Cleveland has been indefinitely delayed until the Federal carrot can be applied to that poor rabbit.

Mr. Chairman, though this bill deals with mass transit in its wording, it is far more than that in its effect. In actuality, it is the keystone in the arch of Federal domination and control of every town in the country. This bill, through the approach of Federal handouts, accomplishes indirectly what this Congress refused to authorize; namely, it sets up the Administrator of HHFA as the czar of all urban affairs.

Already he is in charge of urban renewal, slum clearance, open space, and housing—to mention but a few. Transportation is the glue that binds them all together—and the carrot here is so great that the rabbit will not dare do anything necessary to get it.

A reading of the bill clearly indicates that the standards established for the Administrator's action are so broad and his discretion so great that he could place almost any requirements upon the areas affected. For example, section 4A

of the bill specifies that "no Federal financial assistance shall be provided pursuant to section 3—Federal financial assistance—unless the Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by him, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area and are necessary for the sound economic and desirable development of such area."

Thus, though the community may have a small burden of proof to meet rules established by men—not laws—nonetheless the final say lies with the Administrator. If the local plan calls for a lateral system of monorail transportation, and the Administrator prefers a loop subway system connected by buslines and does not like monorail, I will give you one guess as to what kind of system the city will put in.

One of the reasons for not favoring monorail is that it sticks up in the air and does not necessarily improve the landscape. Under the terms of this bill, the Administrator could turn down a locally conceived transportation plan based on a monorail system purely because it does not fit in with the esthetic design of the high-priced urban redevelopment plan which he approved the week before.

I need hardly recall to your attention that less than a year ago President Kennedy, through his District adviser, injected himself into the development of the District of Columbia and required the delay of major portions of the Interstate Highway System here because of his fear that it would interfere with the esthetic beauty of certain sections of this lovely city. A closer parallel to what I am talking about could not be drawn.

But let us look even further. If this is a transportation bill, why is it not under the Department of Commerce where there is an Assistant Secretary for Transportation, where there are transportation plans being submitted from all over the Nation at a cost of tens of millions of dollars and where there is expert knowledge of transportation matters? Why has it been put in the Housing and House Finance Agency, a branch of Government which concerns itself with many of the sociological plans and intervention in local living in which our Federal Government is presently engaged?

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. I believe the gentleman had better take that up with the Parliamentarian. It is before our committee because we have jurisdiction over it.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I understand that. My question is, why was the bill drawn to put mass transit in the Housing and Home Finance Agency?

Mr. RAINS. Does the gentleman know any way in which it could have been drawn—any other way?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. In the same way the Highway Act was drawn,

to put it under the jurisdiction of the Commerce Department.

Mr. RAINS. Does the gentleman not agree that this is a problem tied into city development and tied even to housing and urban renewal?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I do not want to yield further, but I appreciate the gentleman's frankness, because I was just going to point out that when the question came up in committee he stated frankly that this legislation was drafted and patterned after the Housing Act, not after any Transportation Act.

This bill contemplates that one governmental unit with the responsibility for transportation would be established for an urban area. This unit would be created either by State enabling legislation, by contractual agreement between the governmental bodies within the unit, or perhaps by referendum. Such an approach has merit, inasmuch as it requires an examination of the total transportation problem of an entire area, regardless of the historical political boundary lines.

However, once this area transit authority is created, all matters regarding transportation plans, loans, grants, et cetera, in which the Federal Government is involved flow between that body and the Federal Government. Therefore, under this bill we are rewriting the political subdivisions of our country. We are bypassing State government. We are bypassing city government through the mechanism of the Federal carrot. We are setting out to create, on the one hand, a dominant centralized bureaucracy, and on the other hand, a governmental body much akin to the city states of ancient Greece.

Such was not the case under the highway program. There, the States are an integral part of the planning and supervision of the construction of our national highway system.

Under this bill the administrator has a club which gives him powers over the communities which override those even of their own mayors and other elected officials.

For example, what if, as part of his price for approving the local transportation plan, the Administrator felt the zoning laws of the urban area should be changed? Or, as suggested should be done by my distinguished colleague from Cleveland [Mr. VAN RICK], the Administrator felt the assessments of real estate adjoining rapid transit properties should be changed to comply with his formula? What city council—what county auditor or treasurer could withstand the pressure to change if that was the price required for an urban grant of the size we are talking about?

In effect, as we point out in the minority report, this bill makes the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration the Federal mayor of every main street in this country. I can conceive that a forceful Administrator could utilize this bill—in conjunction with powers granted him under other authority such as the Housing Act—to control not only the physical development of a city, in terms of bricks and mortar and streets and buildings, but also the so-

cial and human life of that community. I object to this bill because it not only contains the germs of the destruction of the historical political governmental relationships of our country, but I am opposed to it because it places in the hands of one bureau the potential control of the standards of living and even the conditions of life at our urban centers.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly for a question?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHLEY. I am wondering whether the gentleman is against this bill or against any bill that would seek to lend Federal assistance to cities and municipalities in trying to solve this mass transit problem.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If the gentleman will permit me, I think I will answer his question at a later point in my remarks.

Some have criticized me for such "dubious fears." Let me make clear that I would rather pass up a mess of pottage any day than give up the rights of the people I represent to have a voice in their local government, and I will pass up that same mess of pottage if it requires local government to become even more of a mockery than it is today.

You may say, how about the housing bill itself—urban renewal, slum clearance, and so forth? I say to you, once we get a tax policy that will return the ability to the urban areas to carry out such work, these Federal programs will become unnecessary and as I said under the debate—under the rule—I hope the Ways and Means Committee will do this next year in revision.

I say to you, my good friends who favor Federal direction and big government, what is wrong? Do you not trust the people? Do you feel our opinion, or that of "the experts" in the bureaus, of what needs to be done superior to that of the people themselves? Do you have so little faith in local government, in differences rather than in uniformity? You do not so profess in your declaration of policy. Then why not give State and local governments the full financial ability possible and let them work out their own priorities and their own solutions to these local problems.

Ours was a central government of limited powers—all others being reserved to the States and local governments—close to the people, where they can follow it.

But if my reasoning so far seems too philosophical and impractical, let us look at other aspects of the transportation situation. What is the cost of this program upon which we are asked to embark? The proponents piously point to a modest figure of \$500 million over a 3-year period. Which I now understand will be at \$375 million. I doubt if there is anyone in this House so naive, however, as to believe that it will end there. This is merely a foot in the door for another large Federal aid program.

The proponents also state that the Federal Government's share—or as our chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] would express it, the Federal seedcorn money—can only amount to two-thirds of the Federal project cost,

or, that portion of the cost which the Administrator estimates cannot be met through local funds and through the fare box. The Comptroller General fairly well hit the kernel on the head, however, when he stated:

We believe that if the administration's concept is fully implemented, most projects will receive Federal and non-Federal grants equal to nearly 100 percent of a project's cost.

Testimony of many other witnesses indicated that the farebox might carry the operating costs, but that local and Federal assistance was required to provide the capital equipment.

It has been estimated by some that the cost of the mass transit plans for 26 communities would be in the neighborhood of \$10 billion but these estimates are based only on large metropolitan areas and even then, in my opinion, fall far short of the mark when one considers that new subway construction, along with the purchase of stations as well as rolling stock and rights-of-way which are contemplated.

Nevertheless, regardless of the staggering costs, which may have to be faced, if the real need exists, we must get it done.

Let me emphasize that I am one who believes that mass transit—and good mass transit—is a necessity for any highly urbanized area. I do not need statistics to know that. I am all too well aware of the difficulty of getting around which exists for our senior citizens, our youngsters, for all those who are either physically or economically unable to drive.

But before I embark on a large program involving the expenditures of Federal funds, I want to see more clearly where we are going.

Just the other day, this Congress raised the national debt to \$324 billion—the seventh time that the debt limit has been raised since 1961.

Not too long ago, we passed, and I voted for, a tax reduction bill with the serious assurance of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and of the majority leadership that the administration intended to hold the line, to run a tight budget, and to initiate no new spending programs. Just this morning, we find a glowing article in the newspaper to the effect that the budget will not be \$11 billion in the red this year but only somewhere above \$8 billion.

Let me recall to this committee that when the \$40 billion interstate highway program was initiated, the carefully drafted legislation which established it was drawn up only after many years of research—20—and engineering had clearly indicated where the greatest needs for new highway construction existed, unlike this bill which is designed to give assistance to every area of 2,500 population or more in order to gain votes on the floor of Congress. The interstate highway program varied by billions of dollars in the amount of Federal aid provided to each of the States. It was based on needs established by careful engineering reports.

Let me remind my colleagues that under the Federal Highway Act of 1961, all

cities of 50,000 population or over are required to submit, or be well on the way toward submitting, a complete and comprehensive transportation plan for its area by July 1, 1965.

The Federal Government is investing millions of dollars—100 million to Bureau of Public Roads—along with the States and municipalities, in the preparation of these plans. These plans are not highway oriented, they are directed toward a balanced transportation system and vary widely from area to area as each area expresses its own opinion as to its needs and requirements for solving them. I submit to the House that any Member who served on a board of directors of a company and authorized the expenditure of company funds for an engineering report—and then proceeded to take action without awaiting the results of this engineering study would be severely criticized—and rightly so—by any stockholder. Particularly would this be true if the report were a study of a contemplated new area of business for that company. I think the Members of this House are in that same position.

Mr. Chairman, opposing any program which, in the eyes of its proponents, is designed to assist in alleviating a public problem is never easy. However, I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill, first, because mass transit is not a national issue but is one that is where the real problem is limited to certain highly urbanized areas; second, because these highly urbanized areas are able, through their own resources, to finance their own solution cheaper than can the hard-pressed Federal Government; third, because this bill is more than a mass transit bill—it is a bill which, in effect, creates the Administrator of HHFA as the czar or Federal mayor of every main street in this country, not just on matters of brick and mortar, but indirectly on matters involving sociological relationships and living conditions. If we want a Federal mass transit bill, let us pattern it after the highway bill not the housing bill and put it under the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation where it belongs; and, fourth, because the scope and the size of this problem is presently unknown—but will be known, as a result of the expenditure of millions of dollars when the local transportation plans now underway are completed. I strongly urge the defeat of this bill because it is badly conceived and badly timed.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3881 which was reported overwhelmingly by my committee and which has been passed by the other body.

PROGRESS SINCE THE HORSE AND BUGGY DAYS

All of us in this Chamber, from radical reactionaries to prudent progressives, take pride in pointing to the progress that has been made in America.

From the horse and buggy days of less than 100 years ago, we have progressed to the point where we can transport man in space.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is a "radical reactionary"?

Mr. MOORHEAD. That is a good term I see in the newspapers nowadays.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Mr. MOORHEAD. But how much progress have we really made since the horse and buggy days?

During most of the day it takes a motorist sitting behind a 300-horsepower engine longer to cross Manhattan in midtown than it took a horse and wagon 100 years ago.

The trip from Newark Airport to the center of Manhattan Island, a distance of 13.4 miles can be made by public transportation in the rush hour in 1 hour and 30 minutes—longer than it took for Colonel Glenn to complete a single orbit of the earth. One hundred years ago a horse and buggy could travel the same distance as the Newark Airport trip in 1 hour and 17 minutes—13 minutes quicker than it can be done today. Is this what we call progress?

POPULAR SUPPORT FOR H.R. 3881

I think that people are beginning to become aware of the problem and to agree that something must be done about it.

On Monday of this week I received nine letters favoring the bill now before us. One letter urged my support "for the good of our area and the city" because "the kind of transportation we have now is so poor." Another handwritten letter said:

In these days of congested traffic and lack of parking facilities in urban areas in large as well as in small towns we are being taxed to find parking spaces for our patrons.

Another wrote unselfishly:

I feel that the enactment of this legislation will enable my friends and neighbors and even myself to have transportation, something we have very little of at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, the people are aware because traffic congestion and the lack of good mass transit are not occasional problems but on the contrary are daily irritants.

Morning and evening five times a week, trolley, bus and subway riders and railroad commuters are subjected to the irritations of inadequate transit. Today the motorists, bumper to bumper on the expressways, are beginning to realize that the nerve-wracking irritations of traffic jams are caused by lack of adequate transit.

H.R. 3881 WILL REDUCE THE TAXPAYERS' BURDEN

The final ironic irritation is that we are being taxed at many times the rates to create these irritations than we would be if we were to provide for adequate public transit. Without mass transportation it is obvious that our very expensive highway program must be increased many, many times.

What are the comparative costs of highways and mass transit? It is generally agreed that 1 lane of rapid transit can carry as many people in one direction as 21 lanes of expressways. In Atlanta, Ga., it was estimated that a mile of rapid transit could be built at

a cost of \$3.5 million per mile, whereas the cost of expressways with approximately the same capacity for moving people would cost about \$42 million per mile. On this basis, expressways cost the taxpayers 12 times as much as rapid transit. A few years ago the Christian Science Monitor computed the cost to each taxpayer from 9 to 17 times as much to pay for a fine rapid transit system to move the same number of people. A recent article in the Washington Post gave the ratio as 16 to 1.

Added to this staggering expense is the tremendous loss to the cities which results when taxable land is eaten up by expressways and downtown garages. Sixty-eight percent of the downtown Los Angeles land area is already consumed for street and parking use. The mayor of Cleveland has said that a 3½-mile freeway which cost \$75 million took \$30 million worth of property off the city tax rolls. Because mass transit does not require large land areas, the potential saving to the Federal and local taxpayer from encouraging mass transit is tremendous.

Because of the Federal highway program, it seems to me that the Federal Government has a legitimate dollars and cents interest in solving the problems of mass transit.

THE GREAT SOCIETY NEEDS HEALTHY CITIES

Less than 1 month before his death President Kennedy expressed his hopes for America when he said:

I look forward to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty, which will protect the beauty of our natural environment * * * which will build handsome and balanced cities for our future.

One month ago President Lyndon B. Johnson expressed his hopes for America in terms of "the great society." He said that the three places where we should begin to build the great society were in the cities, in the countryside, and in our classrooms. Discussing cities first the President said:

It is harder and harder to live the good life in American cities today. * * * There is not enough housing for our people or transportation for our traffic. * * * Our society will never be great until our cities are great. * * * It will be the task of your generation to make the American city a place where future generations will come, not only to live but to live the good life.

The basic question raised by this bill is simply shall we continue to have cities in the United States of America? This is the basic question which we face. Without rapid transit, cities, as we know them, simply cannot grow and flourish. Wilfrid Owen, of the Brookings Institution, once said, "We cannot be both urbanized and motorized."

It may be that the automobile will win out in the struggle with man and that the future of America lies in a total dispersion of people into small towns across the country. If that is the future, then, instead of talking about rapid transit we should be making plans for the orderly decline of our cities and the destruction of our countryside.

However, I do believe that this idea is not only shocking, but unrealistic. I believe that our cities must continue to

serve their function of being the economic and cultural centers of our Nation. Throughout history cities have served this function. Civilizations are almost always city based. From Babylon, Athens, and Rome of the ancient world to Venice and Florence of the Renaissance to Paris, London, and New York of the modern world, cities have been the focus of civilizations. The reasons are obvious. It takes a large concentration of people to support art galleries, symphony orchestras, the opera, and the theater.

There are economic reasons, too. In our complex economy a particular business transaction may well require the bringing together of businessmen, bankers, investment bankers, lawyers, accountants, engineers, and persons of other specialties. Only in a city can such a group be readily and conveniently brought together. America needs and will continue to need its great cities.

Without rapid transit the cities will not be able to carry out their function of facilitating the exchange of goods and ideas and the entire Nation will be the poorer both economically and spiritually.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH].

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I cannot emphasize too strongly that the legislation we are here debating is urgently needed.

Every day that passes without the relief proposed by this bill adds to the seriousness of a situation for which Federal assistance is long overdue.

Though the need for modern, economical urban rapid transit grows daily more acute, existing transit systems are deteriorating.

Mr. George W. Anderson, executive vice president of the American Transit Association, told the House Committee on Banking and Currency that 437 mass transportation operations had been sold or abandoned since 1954. I am informed that currently this figure is approaching 500 sales or abandonments in practically every State in this Nation. Other systems now facing failure can be saved only if we act now on this legislation.

Another alarming fact, disclosed by Mr. Anderson, is that some 60 cities with populations between 25,000 and 50,000 today have no public transportation service at all. One wonders what the people without automobiles do for transportation in these communities. Certainly, these facts lead to agreement with Mr. Anderson's statement that "there is urgent need for the type of relief which H.R. 3881 would provide." The chairman of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Mr. James M. Symes, emphasized this in testimony he presented.

Mr. Symes said:

It is cheaper and more economical for the public to pay the cost of contracting for suburban rail services than to permit these essential services to perish.

The mayor of Detroit, who represented the American Municipal Association in the public hearings on this legislation last year, declared that emergency help is needed for urban mass transportation.

I can vouch for that statement so far as the metropolitan area of northern New Jersey, part of which I have the honor to represent, is concerned. This area is booming with more people, more industry, and definitely more traffic. Despite truly monumental development in highways, the demand for moving people and goods is outstripping the capacity of the new facilities. The New Jersey Turnpike, the Garden State Parkway, the New York Thruway, the second deck on the George Washington Bridge, the three tubes of the Lincoln Tunnel, the two tubes of the Holland Tunnel, as well as many subordinate highways, are jammed at peak hours, and the situation is getting worse every day. The only feasible answer to New Jersey's traffic problems is to raise the standards of public transportation so that people will be attracted to its use.

For the past several years New Jersey has been purchasing improved service on commuter lines in the area. This has been an important stopgap measure, but we need much more and better facilities and equipment. They cannot be provided without Federal financial assistance, as in H.R. 3881.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what happens if a rapid transit service goes out of business?

An answer was given in the testimony of Mr. W. P. Coliton, of Michigan City, Ind., whose company transports from the outlying area thousands of workers who man Chicago's industrial and commercial establishments.

Mr. Coliton said:

If I go out of the passenger business, I am going to have to dump 11,000 commuters onto the existing highways.

Highways are already crowded, he commented, and probably a new one would ultimately have to be built to accommodate the additional traffic. The cost, Mr. Coliton pointed out, would be greater than the cost of keeping the existing rapid transit facilities in operation.

Other types of public transportation facilities are also in jeopardy of being lost to the people who depend upon them for travel to work. Rail facilities are deeply in trouble, and the record indicates that the fault is largely not their own. Federal aid has provided fast highways and subsidies to airlines that have siphoned off their most lucrative passenger traffic. Income from the short-haul commuters alone is insufficient to meet costs. While freight revenues may be used to offset passenger losses for a time, abandonment of much commuter rail service is inevitable unless aid is made available.

Without doubt, aid to existing transit facilities will be far less costly than provision of alternatives, whether highway or other.

The city of Newark, part of which lies in my district, is a good example of another reason why passage of H.R. 3881 is so greatly needed. The Newark area presents three problems in one: First, providing local transportation coordinated with the rail commuter lines; second, improved commuter service between Newark and New York City; and, third,

improved commuter service from the south and west into Newark with some through service to New York.

The magnitude of the Newark situation is indicated by the fact that there is an increase of 125 percent in the city's daytime inhabitants over the night population. The transportation of this vast number of people into and out of Newark each working day poses problems of staggering proportions to all concerned. Almost daily I receive pleas for action of some kind from harried constituents who are exhausted from the daily struggle to get to and from their home and place of business.

Obviously the solution to these problems must be on an areawide—in fact to some extent on a regional basis—with the local program closely coordinated with that of neighboring cities and suburbs. The assistance proposed in H.R. 3881 is designed to give support and incentive toward exactly that type of local effort.

Mr. Chairman, New Jersey will go on record as solidly in favor of the bill.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 3881.

The public transportation system in our country and particularly in the State of Connecticut is a shambles. Between competition from highways and other methods of transportation and short-sighted management, our public systems have gradually fallen into disrepair and disrepute.

Even though the automobile is so widely used and the truck has advanced appreciably as a means of carrying freight, nevertheless, the train or bus remains the sole practical mode of transport for millions of people within this country.

No one believes, I am sure, that we should permit these systems to go down the drain. The differences of opinion relate to the methods of achieving the objective of preserving these vital systems and maintaining them in reasonably good condition.

It is indeed a sad commentary that the great United States with its affluent society, its high standard of living, its fine automobiles, and its luxurious airliners should find its subways far inferior to those in Moscow, and its trains a poor second to those in Japan.

Surely our transportation systems need all the help that they can get, whether it be in the form of financial assistance or in the field of ideas and procedures. The current bill seeks to provide funds for the purposes I have mentioned.

In my own State, the need for help is particularly acute. This is true within our cities and also in the vicinity of the New York metropolitan area of which part of our State is an adjunct.

I believe that this bill represents a reasonable start on a persistent and worsening national problem. Its scope lifts it above the purely regional or local stage. Perhaps the legislation is not perfect and the program will require

some time to eliminate the bugs. Nevertheless, the need is urgent, and now is the time to begin.

My own support of this legislation is buttressed by that of Governor Dempsey, the chief executive of Connecticut, who has long been concerned with the future of mass transportation in New England, and Richard J. Smith and the other trustees of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad who have the duty of managing that rail line. They strongly support H.R. 3881.

If this bill passes it is my hope that it may, supplemented by State, private, and local interests and capital, provide the beginning of a new era in public mass transportation in the United States.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss in general debate some of the provisions that seem likely to come up in the discussion on the amendments when we reach the point of reading the bill. I feel that the time allowed on the amendments themselves may be inadequate. These questions which I shall raise go a good deal further than any minor change in the bill, but rather to some very basic questions with regard to it.

Mr. Chairman, the first of these areas is with regard to the charges that have been made and then denied, that this bill will in effect make the HHFA Administrator the so-called mayor of Main Street who can, in any way that he wishes, in any areas that take on the assistance that is said to be provided by this program determine what is to happen in the entire transportation planning of the cities and villages involved.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that anyone has pointed out the fact that we are getting down to areas so small in size under this bill as it is drawn that they would qualify only as villages. At least, in my own State the minimum limitation is some 2,500 people, the ordinary definition of urban areas, which is the definition in the bill. In Ohio, at least, if you do not have 5,000 people you cannot qualify as a city. So, we are talking about villages. The HHFA Administrator has, I think, the final say in this connection as to what is the test. As a result of this I offered an amendment in the committee when the measure was being considered and after some protestations that there was no intention or attempt under this bill to give this broad power over the conduct of transit facilities in any assisted community to the Administrator. I suggested, for instance, if there was no fear of this that perhaps an amendment would be in order. I offered an amendment which would come in the bill on page 24 at the end of section 9, adding another subsection therein at that point which would have read:

(e) No provisions of this Act shall be construed to authorize the Administrator to regulate in any manner the mode of operation of any mass transit system or the rates, fares, tolls, rentals, or other charges fixed or prescribed by any local public or private transit agency.

I believe the committee would be interested to know that that amendment failed by a tie vote. It is true that some Members of the majority party even voted for that amendment, going along with their apparent conviction that these powers were contained therein and I say that they are. Under this bill, the powers as they would be interpreted I believe by any court, the HHFA Administrator would in many areas that would receive this help have the authority and the power to regulate rates and to stipulate conditions for the operation of the entire transit system.

Mr. Chairman, I believe for the purposes of making clear the record on this question today, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, if he would respond for the purpose of expressing his opinion on the question of whether the HHFA Administrator would have these powers under the bill?

Mr. RAINS. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that in my honest opinion that is a figment of somebody's imagination. The answer is "No." I do not think he would have that power whatever. There is nothing in the bill which says he would. That is imaginary, in my opinion. And, I would like for the RECORD to show that I for one not only think he would not have it but I would not want him to have it.

Mr. TAFT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he sees anything in the bill in the case of any grant to such qualifying community which gives this power to regulate rates and stipulate conditions for the operation of a local transit system?

Mr. RAINS. I do not think the Administrator would have the authority to write into any contract such requirements which are not contemplated by the bill at all.

Mr. TAFT. I would ask the gentleman if, on the reading of the bill for amendment, I should offer an amendment along the lines of the amendment offered in the committee, could I then be justified in expecting his support of such an amendment?

Mr. RAINS. I would oppose the amendment because it would be superfluous, in my judgment. I would not want to put in any preachment in there when he has not the power. That might infer he has that power, and I would oppose the amendment because I do not think it is justified.

Mr. TAFT. I will discuss the matter with the gentleman later.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I think the amendment should be defeated for an additional reason. When any unit or private enterprise applies for a loan or grant under the legislation, it seems to me that program has to be presented to the agency to see whether or not these moneys, if applied for in a grant or loan, would help the transportation system. Certainly when investigating and considering an application for a loan or

grant, there will be contained in the application projected figures which would include the fare rate and the amount of traffic expected and the type of route traveled, and so forth. I think that might get us into trouble if we were to put in the gentleman's amendment as it was offered in committee.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it would. And I think that emphasizes the point I was making, which is the economic feasibility of the plan proposed. Under "the project cost" determination he might raise the fares. This is a right he is given under the bill.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. If an amendment is offered, does the gentleman mean to make it plain and simple that he shall have no authority to regulate fares and rates, or does the gentleman expect to put other requirements in it?

Mr. TAFT. No. My amendment offered in committee, and the amendment I would propose to offer, would cover that. I think the language in the committee did include "regulated in any way," or the mode of operation of the system, which seems to be the rate-setting power. The rate-setting power might be determined.

Mr. RAINS. Would the gentleman be content with an amendment which would state that the Administrator had no authority to regulate rates?

Mr. TAFT. I will offer such amendment separately if I can get the gentleman's support, and it sounds as though I might.

I would like to go on further at this time and discuss in some little detail the provisions involved in the so-called proposed labor amendment. We do not know, of course, what those provisions will say until the amendment is offered; however, I think certain things might be noted as to the form in which it is to be presented.

I call your attention to section 10(c) of the bill which states "It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance under this act that fair and equitable arrangements are made."

Under the bill as it presently reads those arrangements are to be approved by the Administrator. The Administrator acts only after consideration, consultation, and concurrence of the Secretary of Labor. I understand the proposed amendment will take the Administrator out of the proceeding and turn over the arrangement to the Department of Labor.

What the purpose of this is hard to say. The interest of the Administrator representing all cities makes him the dominant factor in arriving at a fair and equitable arrangement.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman complained a moment ago about the Administrator having too much power. Now he turns around and complains because he has not enough power.

Mr. TAFT. I think this depends on what area is involved. I think it is better to have two people involved instead of just the one, particularly one concerned with all sides of the economic arrangements that may be arrived at, whereas in the case of the Department of Labor I do not think that could always be assumed to be true.

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman will agree, I am sure, that if it is a labor matter it would be better to be handled by the Labor Department than some other department?

Mr. TAFT. I think the Secretary of Labor should be consulted as is presently provided in the bill if such arrangements are to be worked out. However, I do not think he is to be the sole judge. That is apparently the intention of what the amendment as it is proposed will be.

Mr. RAINS. Not necessarily. I think the gentleman is imagining again. I do not know that that will be true. But the gentleman will agree that a labor problem under our setup is better to be considered by the Labor Department than the Housing Administrator or Secretary of State.

Mr. TAFT. Where it involved the operation of the system I think it important that the person who is in charge of the administration of the system itself, the Administrator of the HHFA in this case, be a factor in concluding such arrangements. Otherwise, it would give the Secretary of Labor the power to veto and dominate the entire situation.

Mr. RAINS. I do not think the gentleman need have any fear along that line.

Mr. TAFT. Moving on to other provisions I understand are to be added in connection with these arrangements, it is stated that these arrangements shall include—this is presently in the bill; this is compulsory, not voluntary—these arrangements shall include certain provisions. The first of these provisions is the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits under existing collective bargaining agreements. I do not think many of us would argue with this concept of continuing collective bargaining if there is collective bargaining, if they are to be changed or added to under this act. However, in the Senate bill, and I understand in the amendment to be offered, there are included the words "or otherwise." What the meaning of these words would be would be impossible to tell. Presumably they might start out by referring to one of the practices not guaranteed, or benefits not guaranteed, not given, except at irregular intervals, perhaps Christmas bonuses, something not covered by collective bargaining agreements. But if we incorporate this in the bill, it will be compulsory on the Administrator or the Secretary of Labor, whichever it turns out to be, or both, to go ahead and put in some kind of new rules, taking out all these informal benefits that might exist and perpetuate them in this kind of system.

With regard to this section I think it might be interesting to turn to the Senate debate on the amendment on this point. It was stated that the amendment was being opposed because nobody knows

what the amendment will do. It continued:

I know that my good friend from Oregon, who is one of the best lawyers who has ever served in this body, did not write this amendment. I am sure that if he had had an opportunity to consider it at great length his trained legal mind would have made many changes in it.

There he was referring to the "otherwise" provision.

At another point, the conclusion of an arrangement about the continuation of collective bargaining rights, with regard to the continuance of collective bargaining rights as they exist, I do not think many of us would have much to argue about that in this case, but if there is a change of ownership of a system under private ownership to public ownership, we may very well under these circumstances be running into a prohibition on certain transit operations in which there is a prohibition against any public ownership getting any benefits under this bill, because under the law in that locality they would not have such bargaining rights. Under the law this was prohibited, and this was contained in a similar Senate amendment, as to which the sponsor of the amendment stated:

I want to be very frank as I say this today: In rare cases in which local law prohibits collective bargaining, Federal money would not be available, because it would be in conflict with the policy of the bill.

I would suggest to the Members that they check on the laws of their particular cities and their particular States to see whether or not this will be the case because they may very well find that the provisions of this bill and the provisions of this amendment will simply rule you out of any possible consideration in connection with the help that might come under this bill if, indeed, it is passed.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN].

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, the point I think is very important here is whether or not there is a real necessity for the legislation and I would like to come before you now and give the specifics that we are encountering now in my State.

Mr. Chairman, in my State, which we are proud to call Rhode Island and Providence Plantations because of its early rural character, we are today faced with a crisis in the provision of public transportation to serve the needs of an urban concentration of population approaching a million people. Our principal transit system, privately owned and operated, is being forced to pare its service to maintain a profitable operation, though it has one of the highest fares in the country. Total abandonment of this private service is a distinct possibility which our legislature has already recognized through the establishment of a Rhode Island Public Transit Authority. Let me discuss the background for this situation and why enactment of H.R. 3881 is important to us—as it is to many other urban areas.

The 1960 census focused national attention on the fact that urban America now embraces 70 percent of our population. Even more significant is the fact

that three-fourths of this urban population, now about 100 million people, live in 213 metropolitan areas constituting less than 1 percent of the total area of the country. By 1980, less than 16 years hence, 80 percent of the population will be living under urban conditions.

I come from southern New England where urbanization is even greater. As early as 1840, Rhode Island became the first State to have its urban population outnumber the rural population. Today the Rhode Island population is classed as 86.4 percent urban, Connecticut's is 78.3 percent and that of Massachusetts is 83.6 percent. In fact, in these States, and there are many others in which the same conditions prevail, corridors of contiguous urbanized development extend across the entire State. The two metropolitan areas in Rhode Island both extend across the State line into Massachusetts.

Many factors have supported and encouraged this tremendous urban growth. Perhaps the greatest common denominator has been the ability of people to travel throughout these spreading metropolitan communities by different modes of transport according to individual means and needs. These have changed radically from the early streetcar and suburban electric railway lines to the bus and rapid transit systems of today, augmented in very large measure by the private automobile. In becoming the major means of personal transportation, the automobile has required a tremendous investment in streets and highways—especially freeways. Of note is the fact that half of the more than \$40 billion being spent on the National System of Interstate Highways is being spent in urban areas.

In Rhode Island we have concluded that public transit service must be planned and supported on a statewide basis and as a public responsibility in the public interest. This is essential to a sound urban economy and to a desirable distribution of industry, business, and the maintenance of healthy home environments. As a basis for wise decisions and the exercise of effective public authority, there is underway a statewide land-use transportation planning program which will develop needs and definite plans for highway development and mass transportation. Connecticut, I understand, is doing likewise.

The newly created Rhode Island Public Transit Authority is already taking the first steps to meet the crisis brought about by the deteriorating privately owned and operated transit service. After a legislative finding that public passenger transportation was essential to the continued economic development and growth of Rhode Island and that the public interest might best be served by a public transportation system, the authority was given the power, under appropriate conditions, to prepare plans for continued operation and acquisition of mass transportation service.

Already the authority has proposed to employ a transportation consultant to make a study of the public necessity for transit service and the appropriate means for providing it under the Transit

Authority Act. I am given to understand this afternoon that much of this work has been completed. The consultant is to determine the financial requirements, available sources of revenues from fares and otherwise, and the form of ownership and management needed to satisfy the public interest.

H.R. 3881 will do for public transportation what the Federal Government has been doing to aid the States, cities, and suburbs in development of a highway system for the mass movement of people by private automobile, particularly in growing metropolitan areas. No such Federal aid has been provided for the contemporary modernization and extension of public transit systems. The bill would help to overcome this lag or imbalance in the development of public transportation. Many of the strongest advocates of the highway program now recognize that multimillion dollar highways and freeways cannot endlessly provide for urban transportation needs. In fact many have calculated that wise expenditures for the improvement of public transportation will save many times the public expense that would be necessary to provide the same capacity over additional highway lanes.

The urban transportation bill has been designed to meet the needs that I have outlined. It is adaptable for both small and large communities and applicable to both public and privately owned transit systems. The benefits of this legislation would be available throughout urban America wherever there is need for financial assistance.

I wish to join the previous speakers on behalf of this bill and urge its enactment for the purpose of meeting the needs we face and the crisis which we shall face in the near future.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER].

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, what I hope to do is to lay out some figures, and to review some historical facts. I believe we can establish, right here, that mass transportation is not a convenience but a necessity; not a desirable urban program, but an absolute urban imperative.

Let us look at some of the great cities of the world—Paris, London, New York, Tokyo, Moscow, Boston, Chicago. No one will tell you, "In New York, all we need is a few more lanes of expressways." Hardly. Each of these cities has long had a highly developed system for mass transportation—and those systems are vital to their very existence.

Automobiles, despite their convenience and independence of movement, have created a host of problems. Only last year, for instance, did the Congress pass the Clean Air Act, designed to meet, among other problems, air pollution from automobile exhausts. The great cities of our Nation and of the world could hardly survive with automobile traffic alone. They function as centers of activity—commercial, financial, cultural, governmental—because their systems are capable of moving great numbers of people in and out, back and forth, to and

fro. Without that ability, they would rapidly deteriorate.

Let me review quickly the beginnings of some of the world's most famous transit systems—the Metro, the Tube, the Underground, the subway, the MTA.

The Metro was begun in 1900 when Paris had a population of 2,700,000. The Tube was opened in London in 1863 when that city had a population of 2,363,000. The subway in Moscow, was constructed in 1934 when the population of Moscow was 3,600,000. Boston opened the MTA in 1897 when its population was 561,000. The Chicago and New York subways were built in 1943 and 1904 respectively, when those cities had populations of 3,390,000 and 3,400,000.

Subways and elevated trains are not new. They began in another era—the railroad age. Then came the automobile, which has proliferated beyond all imagination. Yet the need for these mass systems, predating the automobile, is ever greater—because of the automobile.

The fact to be recognized here is that these cities began their rapid transit systems when they were the same size as a number of American cities will be by 1975, the leadtime required to build new systems.

In 1975, Minneapolis-St. Paul will have 2,100,000 people; Denver, 1,500,000; Atlanta, 1,470,000; St. Louis, 3 million. The Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C., will have more than 3,500,000 people in its metropolitan area.

The point of the population figures is this: The early systems were built at the same population stage as those of the emerging cities of the United States.

The fact is, we cannot maintain a growing city whose only mode of transportation is the expressway.

Many critics of mass transportation are blind to these facts.

They will tell you that the concept of mass transportation is outmoded. They will cite reams of figures on declining passenger usage, financially failing public and private transit systems. Yet these arguments ignore some very simple statistics, some very simple facts. We have tried highways as a sole solution, and it has failed.

In cities of more than 1 million population in the United States, more than 75 percent of the people travel to and from work by some form of mass transit. A transit strike in New York, such as the one in 1957, is a major catastrophe.

Some critics are more charitable. They will accept the argument that the systems we presently have are needed. But they immediately contend that we need no new systems. They say that people will not leave their cars and ride a new system. Yet, history proves them wrong.

Cleveland, a city of 936,000 at the time, built a new subway system which opened in 1955. The passenger load for the first full year of operation was 14.7 million trips. By 1960, the passenger trip figure had risen to 18.3 million. Automobiles were left at home: The fare box offers irrefutable proof.

Let us now turn again to the emerging new cities of America. Atlanta is one of these. They are the regional capi-

tals, with populations between 1 and 2 million. They have grown by serving as the financial, educational, transportation, warehousing, manufacturing, and communications centers for geographic regions of our country. Among them are Atlanta, Dallas-Fort Worth, Denver, Kansas City, St. Louis, Minneapolis-St. Paul.

They are vital cities, growing cities, serving as the center for the countryside and smaller cities around them.

They have all the problems of growing cities—the need for more schools, sewers, parks, the problem of air pollution, water pollution, and urban blight.

But one problem common to all is transportation. All have central cities and central business districts.

None of them have adequate mass transit systems. All are expressway cities, and all, in varying degrees—face serious problems.

Mr. Glenn Bennett, executive director of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, testified before the committee last year when hearings were held on this bill. He presented a graphic statistical picture of the traffic situation in Atlanta:

Like other areas, our growth in population has been exceeded by increases in the number of motor vehicles. While the population was growing at 40 percent, rubber-tired vehicles increased at about 75 percent. We see this trend continuing.

As early as 1958 our planning studies revealed major problems in connection with access to central Atlanta, particularly in rush hours. The small area known as central Atlanta provides more than 20 percent of the tax digest, more than 25 percent of the city's employment, and 20 percent of the employment in the five-county area. Streets and expressways were discovered to be operating at considerably more than practical capacities even then, in 1958. Programmed capital improvements are still not destined to bring the capacity up to the rising demand, much less keep it there.

Atlanta has been building an expressway system since 1946, when it was a city of 560,000. Today the metropolitan area has more than 1,100,000 people. We're still building, and the traffic situation worsens daily. By 1970, automobile traffic would require 36 expressway lanes north and south, and 22 east and west. Already more than one-half of our central city is devoted to streets and parking lots.

The absurdity of having only street transportation in Atlanta is obvious just by stating the requirement, 58 expressway lanes by 1970, where we only have built 14 in the last 18 years.

Regional cities are growing at an average of 50 percent each decade. Last year, Atlanta grew by 34,000 people. By 1980, it will be a city close to 2 million people.

The facts are obvious. Great cities absolutely require multiple-transportation systems. But the regional capitals of the United States are moving toward metropolitan status with only expressways.

If we are to have mass transit systems to meet demands, we must begin now. To postpone mass transit systems is to consign regional cities to the awful and expensive fate of piecing their towns back together in the future.

A very modest beginning toward the development of systems for the regional capitals—and for my home—Atlanta—is embodied in H.R. 3881, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963.

I say "modest," for this bill provides only \$500 million in matching funds for the development of systems.

The projected Atlanta system, alone, would cost approximately \$300 million. But H.R. 3881 would allow us to begin. And it would allow other cities like Atlanta to begin to develop alternatives to expressways, traffic jams, parking lots, and carbon monoxide.

Mr. Chairman, we must act before all American cities become vast wastelands of concrete and stalled cars.

I urge support of this bill, not because it is helpful, or progressive, or forward looking—but because it is a historic imperative.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3881, an important bill that will provide Federal loans and partial grants on a matching basis to States and localities in order to assist and encourage the development of urban mass transportation systems. The problem of urban and suburban transportation has reached crisis proportions. The time has come for Congress to recognize the fact that we live in an urban society with overlapping interstate transportation problems within and between huge urban complexes. The Federal Government always must concern itself with problems national in scope and beyond the capacities of localities to cope with alone. Certainly if the Nation's highway structure can be considered a Federal responsibility, the transportation problems of urban complexes are even more so.

The modern history of the American city is the history of its steady deterioration. The central city is being strangled by traffic congestion, choked by automobile fumes, darkened and depressed by overhead expressways; the peripheral areas are being blighted by "sprawl," and the suburbs are attracting the groups that formerly gave the city its essential tax base. In recent years farsighted planners have agreed that many new things must be done to revitalize our cities; they have agreed that a contributing factor to the decline of cities has been their chaotic transportation system. Paradoxically, another contributing factor has been the enormous assistance and encouragement the Federal Government has given to highway construction for automobiles and trucks. We have not yet covered all of the country with concrete but we are coming close.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, a sensible system of urban mass transportation will not transform the city into a paradise; nor will it necessarily relieve all traffic congestion. But it will establish a precondition for what, during the next two decades, will have to be a crash program to humanize the American city.

By 1980 the total population of the United States is expected to reach 250 million, of which at least 75 percent will be living in urban areas. Further, this population will be concentrated in about 40 great urban complexes, each with a population of more than 1 million. There is no question that present transportation facilities will be totally inadequate to accommodate these huge urban and suburban areas. It is unmistakably clear that existing systems of streets, highways, buslines, and rail transit, inadequate as they are today, will not alone be able to handle this rapid population growth in the future, much less today. Trying to catch up with the present is almost a big enough problem. New techniques of mass transportation, while not a panacea, will bring into balance modes of transportation that have gone all out of balance.

A transportation system must be viewed in terms of the impact it makes on the total urban area and, most importantly, on people; it must be viewed as bound up with the quality and character of the entire community. At a time when population buildups are occurring on the fringes of big cities, a program of modern urban mass transportation could provide a sensible link between the suburbs and the central city, offsetting the great pressure to choke and entangle both with expressways. A byproduct of suburban sprawl has been the shifting of traffic congestion during the morning hours to the suburban areas. The result is that in some areas getting to the city is less a problem than getting out of the suburbs. Thus, people dependent solely on private automobiles find themselves isolated in the suburb. With a system of urban mass transportation, more people would have easier access to the commercial and cultural opportunities that can be found only in the central city.

Let us be clear that an urban mass transportation system will benefit not just the suburbs. It will be of enormous benefit to the central city. It will enhance the possibilities for central city development, promote livability in core areas of the city now strangled by traffic congestion, choked by gasoline fumes, and darkened by overhead expressways. Indeed, my own city of New York seems increasingly enveloped by a mantle of automotive smog, and the pressures to build more overhead expressways are enormous. The highway and automobile engineers seem to care little about the people who live in the city as they pour their wide ribbons of concrete, happily spurred on by large injections of 90 percent Federal money. The Lower Manhattan Expressway in New York City is one good example: an overhead monster that will make living close to intolerable in lower Manhattan and the lower part of Greenwich Village. It is time, Mr. Chairman, that consideration be given to the people who live in the city. Without them there is no city. The history of the decline and fall of cities has been the history of neglect of the people who live within them.

The problem of mass transportation cannot be dismissed, as it has been by

some, as merely a local problem. The problem clearly has become national. The task of providing adequate mass transportation facilities overlaps neighboring political jurisdictions. Often the problem involves more than one State. It is a fact that about 53 of the country's roughly 200 metropolitan areas either border on or cross over State lines. Local areas will not, by themselves, be able to untangle these conflicting jurisdictions. Finally, to say that mass transportation is a local problem is to say that the Nation does not have a national stake in the economic vitality and health of our urban areas.

A further trouble is that State and local resources are close to exhaustion; they cannot alone develop the urgently needed transportation systems that must be developed if years of neglect are to be retrieved. The transportation companies themselves are caught in a dilemma. They are plagued by rising capital and operating costs and, due to the popularity of the automobile, declining patronage, yet if fares are raised and services curtailed, more customers are driven or drive away. At the same time the necessity of the role of mass transportation in the public interest cannot be denied. During peak hours about 90 percent of the travel to the central business areas in large cities is provided by mass transit systems. Private initiative lacks the resources needed to provide necessary services for commuters and rides during off-peak hours. So what is our choice? Do we go along this way and do nothing? Do we continue to let ourselves be choked to death by expressways? Or do we seek to provide a remedy?

During the next 10 years the 20 largest cities in the United States are expected to invest as much as \$10 billion in mass transit facilities. To encourage greater investment in these and the many other cities throughout the Nation which will need mass transportation systems, this bill should be passed. H.R. 3881 is not a perfect bill; it makes no contribution to resolving the labor difficulties which have plagued the railroads in recent years. Yet this measure is a start; it recognizes that what is needed is a balanced urban transportation system which utilizes both highways and rapid transit. At a time when the country has been happy to continue a \$41 billion Federal aid highway program, I do not believe that we cannot afford the modest expenditure suggested by this measure for mass, rapid, and modern transit. I strongly urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I do so firmly convinced that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to assist the metropolitan areas in developing comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems. The free flow of transportation knows no State boundaries and any strangulations thereof, not only affects the well-being of the individual but has a dire effect on our economy.

This principle, Mr. Chairman, was recognized in the program initiated under

the provisions of the Housing Act of 1961 and it is imperative that the program be continued and reinforced as provided for in H.R. 3881. This is good legislation and I am privileged to be a cosponsor of it.

H.R. 3881 will provide long-range Federal aid to help plan and develop the comprehensive and balanced urban transportation which is so vitally needed, not only to improve local transportation but to assure more effective use of Federal funds available for other urban development and renewal programs.

The fact that existing facilities cannot be maintained is proof that future requirements cannot be met without Federal assistance, particularly since State and city financial ability to meet the problems has been exhausted. Federal aid for mass transportation would follow the pattern of that to airports, urban renewal projects, and other services and facilities of national concern and benefit. Provisions of H.R. 3881 recognize that local participation is vital and that the Federal Government should not do the whole job.

Federal assistance funds, like those under the mass transportation grant program for experiment in transportation improvement, would make local funds which are available more productive and the national interest generated would stimulate additional local response and encourage action.

The mere fact that the mass transit systems are in metropolitan areas or cities does not mean that the problems are only local problems. Over the last two decades more and more people have moved into suburban areas so that central cities and their surrounding areas are becoming increasingly larger and more complex metropolitan areas.

Many people now live adjacent to regional employment centers, good schools, and recreational facilities easily reached by modern streets and highways. At the same time a number of problems are created, one of the most critical being that of maintaining transportation facilities to meet the wide range of needs in the urban complex. Transportation must be adequate throughout the entire metropolitan area, from one part to another, and between all parts and the central core area. Mass transportation service is essential to the economic health of urban centers; large numbers of people must be moved to and from work in a few hours. Approximately 86 percent of the 1½ million people who enter the central business district of Manhattan in the morning peak hours on an average day use mass transportation—subways, bus, railroad, and ferry. A similar situation exists in other major downtown areas.

The Architectural Forum, October 1963, published some relevant statistics which I quote here:

1. In the last decade, central cities' populations have risen only 10 percent, while suburban population has risen over 50 percent.

2. In the same period 12 of the 13 largest core cities showed absolute population declines, while the suburbs grew steadily.

3. By 1980, central cities will hold less than half of the population of the largest metropolitan areas.

4. Shifts in employment indicate that in another decade or so there will actually be more jobs in the suburbs than in the cities. New York City, which had 60 percent of its region's jobs in 1956, expects to have only 48 percent in 1985.

5. Urban populations are consuming more land as they spread out. In 1950, every square mile of suburban land contained 5,410 persons, but by 1960, the figure had declined to 3,759 persons per square mile, and it continues to decline.

The forecast is that within 20 years half of the Nation's population will be concentrated in 40 major urban cities, each with a population of over one million, and that 25 years hence 80 percent of the total population will be in the metropolitan areas. The urban complex finances, produces or arranges for production and marketing of most goods we use, for defense weapons, clothes, and so forth, in fact all except the growing of food. These essential functions can be performed only if people and goods can be moved quickly and easily within the urban complexes. Efficient transportation is a basic factor.

The New York-New Jersey-Connecticut transit district includes 10 percent of the people of the United States. People who live and work in this region pay 20 percent of the Nation's taxes. Several hundred national and international companies have home offices in New York. These companies consider accessibility of their offices more than a purely local matter. Many functions of the central cities cannot be subdivided or duplicated in suburban shopping districts. It is in the national interest to see that these centers of manufacturing, finance, and trade—such as New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Boston, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Cleveland, Detroit, and Los Angeles—operate efficiently and effectively. Mass transportation is essential to assure these results.

Mass transportation must be maintained and rehabilitated where it exists, and planned for in areas where anticipated growth and population, and employment patterns make mass transportation essential. No business can survive with a large capital investment and operating force which are in use only 20 hours a week. Even with modern equipment, proper maintenance, and efficient operations, such a business loses money. The mass transit situation today is the result of years of deferred maintenance and neglect—cars built 50 years ago are still lurching over the lines.

Why do local and State governments permit such conditions? For one thing, their tax resources are not adequate or available to meet all the demands and funds are not available for all needs. Institutions for care of physically and mentally ill, education, recreation, and other facilities suffer from lack of financing. Mass transit has been at the end of the line although State and local governments have done what they can, for example in Philadelphia, Boston, and elsewhere.

Since World War II the revenue of mass transportation companies has fallen

because of offpeak and weekend rider decreases. In the meantime capital and operating expenses have increased. Carriers have raised fares, trimmed service to a minimum and deferred maintenance with the result that more riders have been driven away and the downward spiral accelerated. Thus the ability of transit to provide good service during the work hours when it is needed most is impaired. Public funds are needed to fill the gap between transit needs and what the operators can afford to provide.

The basic problem is one of funds for necessary capital improvements. Passenger revenues are sufficient to meet operating expenses only. Major capital expenditures for basic system improvement and equipment are, in most instances abroad, provided by local and national governments directly or through assumption of responsibility for necessary debt service from general tax revenue.

The financial assistance proposed by H.R. 3881 is designed to help rehabilitate transit systems so they can serve the public. If service is sufficiently attractive more riders will patronize the service and farebox revenues will cover operating costs. To be effective, plans and programs for mass transit must be coordinated with land-use planning so that transit investment is coordinated with other major metropolitan area development.

Rail transit requires about 100,000 persons moving in and out of the central business district in rush hours to support its operations. There are only a few cities where population density makes this possible—New York, Philadelphia, and Boston already have rail rapid transit which was formerly more or less self-supporting, but which has suffered a decline in patronage in the past several years.

Congestion and inadequate urban transportation are a burden to the national economy. Loss of time, added fuel consumption, and so forth, because of traffic congestion adds to the cost of moving goods through metropolitan areas and hence to prices paid by the consumer for these goods. The mass transportation bill, H.R. 3881, should pass this House overwhelmingly so that a meaningful start may be made toward solving these critical mass transit problems.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to support this legislation which I consider absolutely essential to the further growth and development of urban life in the United States.

To those who criticize the entry of the Federal Government into the problems of mass transit, I want to point out that the Federal Government has been vitally interested in mass transit for a long, long time.

The first interest of the Federal Government in mass transit occurred in the Federal Government's land grant program to develop a nationwide railroad system. Almost simultaneously, the

Federal Government commenced extensive participation in the development of waterways and harbor development—an expenditure which today runs into an astronomical dimension.

The Federal Government is deeply involved in airborne mass transit with an aggregate investment of \$797,928,444 in airports and an annual expenditure of \$600 million to monitor airborne traffic. In fiscal 1964, 80 million Federal dollars were spent to build and improve airports while \$210,359,000 was spent to monitor air traffic for the expeditious movement of the new masses which rely on air travel. Between the period of 1954-64, Federal subsidies to air carriers for carrier operation have totaled \$661,665,000.

The Federal Government's investment in the 886,678 miles of highways would total up to a staggering figure.

There can be little argument with these Federal activities in mass transit. There can be little valid argument with the extension of these benefits to the increasing numbers of citizens who live in urban areas and find themselves in a condition of increasing transportation paralysis.

There are those forces in the competing systems of individual transport which seek to suppress the development of a mass transportation system. This approach is short sighted. It is impossible to develop a system of individual motor vehicle transport broad enough to provide for all transportation needs. Individual motor transport is a luxury which our generation may be the last to enjoy. As a matter of fact, the future growth of individual automobile transport depends very considerably and perhaps chiefly upon the development of mass transit systems to siphon off great volumes of traffic which would otherwise contribute to the congestion and glut of our highway system.

My support of a mass transit system is not wedded to the use of a rail system. Motor buses on exclusive right-of-ways may provide more flexible and perhaps less expensive systems. Some sections of our country may be better served by a rail system while others may be better served by buses or a combination of both. The administrators of this program should be able to cooperate in the development of such a system as each metropolitan community should deem most suitable.

Today, the daily loss of man-hours in individual travel to and from the place of employment is beyond conjecture. Many workers fight vigorously for fringe benefits and 10-minute coffee breaks and exert their hardest daily work in negotiating transit from home to the place of employment. In this community, it is not unusual for citizens to spend 2 to 3 hours of the day in transit. In the trip to work, the workers consumes the fresh start time—the hours of maximum energy—to the difficult chore of getting to the job. The employer—whether it be a corporation, another individual, or the Government itself—gets the benefit of such skill or energy which may be left in the worker after he “has made it to the job.” Sometimes all that is left for the job is a live, warm, exhausted body, in varying degrees of asphyxiation from

highway monoxide. The compulsory human intake of poisonous air in daily highway congestion constitutes a major community health problem.

Today there are a total of 91 million motorists. The total number increases at the current rate of approximately 3 million per year.

We lose 50,000 motorists each year as traffic casualties. More significantly, we had a total last year of over 19 million highway accidents which involved over 20 percent of the total number of motorists. Therefore, the average motorist must expect an accident to occur statistically at least 20 percent of the time. Of the 91 million motorists on our highways, approximately 20 percent are physically, mentally, or emotionally unfit to drive. Their presence upon our highways at any given time has converted driving from a pleasure to a difficult, trying task. Our failure to develop an adequate mass transit system has contributed immeasurably to the annual highway toll of 50,000 deaths and 19 million accidents.

As a trial judge for 7 years before I came to Congress, it was my duty to review thousands of highway accidents. Today the legal controversies resulting from claims for personal injuries and property damage are glutting the courts of every community in the land. Traffic congestion and casualty have become court congestion, and there is no relief in sight.

Successful mass transit systems can reduce this toll of life and property and contribute to the comfort and convenience of future generations.

In my Cleveland community, the taxpayers of the city have a \$45 million equity in a transportation system which has a value far in excess of its \$58 million book value. It would be safe to calculate the present value of the system at well over \$100 million. At the present time, the growth and expansion of this system is thwarted by limitations on capital expenditure for expansion. We urgently need help from a Federal mass transportation program to make our transportation system serve the total community and thus multiply its capacity to serve community needs. The \$45 million investment of other local citizens of my community is indicative of the deep local interest in mass transit. This interest is worthy of Federal encouragement.

A few minutes ago, my distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable OLIVER BOLTON, brought into discussion a question which I raised in committee concerning the feasibility of the creation of metropolitan mass transportation authority, to be created under the laws of the several States. I suggested that perhaps the extension of mass transportation systems might be made self-liquidating to a considerable extent if land in the immediate vicinity of system station stops or interchanges were acquired by such a transportation authority and then resold by the authority for planned use for high-rise residential purposes. This kind of a program would prevent land speculators from making windfall profits in the higher land values

resulting from access to interchange or station stop. The benefits from increased land values at newly developed interchanges or station stops would flow back to the local transportation authority which created the increased values and to the commuting public which paid for the system. It is my hope that this idea will be carefully studied by those who seek to establish mass transportation systems. It will produce more mass transportation for less outlay and would preserve advantages within the integrity of the system.

Under this bill, there are many ways in which every large urban community can develop its mass transportation system. It can be developed through public or private ownership or a combination of both. It can be developed as a rail, monorail, or highway bus system, or a combination of each. Each community may devise a plan to suit its individual needs, the only obligation as far as Federal participation is concerned, is that the plan be workable and economically feasible. We must leave considerable discretion with those who administer the program. Continued Federal support will depend on the wisdom with which this act will be administered.

I believe it will be in safe hands and that a creditable record will be made in this necessary area of Federal participation.

In stimulating the development of urban mass transportation, we are making our cities more useful, we are increasing the productivity of urban workers and spreading the innumerable benefits of urban life far into the countryside.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLOREY].

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Chairman, the Congress is again faced with legislation calling for a subsidy of urban mass transportation. The bill we are considering today, H.R. 3881, proposes a \$500 million Federal cash subsidy which would be available exclusively to municipally owned transportation systems and in which the State or local governments would be required to share up to 50 percent of the cost of many of the subsidized programs.

There is justifiable interest in my 12th Congressional District of Illinois for some program of assistance to urban mass transportation—especially in view of the recent abandonment of the North Shore Line and the financial problems faced by the various railroad systems serving Lake, McHenry, and Boone Counties. The suburban and commuter communities of Lake and McHenry Counties are particularly concerned by any reduction or elimination of service to and from Chicago. In addition, of course, the services of various business and the CTA are closely tied in with the welfare of our 12th District citizens.

But the big push for a federally financed program comes not from the people but from this administration as a political measure. I recognize, too, that there is support from the New York area where commuters residing in New Jersey,

Connecticut, and New York State suburbs are operating on a day-to-day basis assisted by a myriad of State and local programs which help keep the trains running. Other large cities, including Chicago, are also applying some pressures for a Federal program.

In the face of a Federal deficit estimated at from \$10 to \$15 billion, it can hardly be argued that the Federal Government can better afford such a program than can the States and municipalities involved. A federally financed program may be further challenged by the fact that San Francisco citizens recently voted a \$792 million bond issue to be retired from local taxes in order to provide a comprehensive metropolitan transit system for the San Francisco Bay Area. As one can see, this is larger than the entire proposed Federal program which would be aimed at curing the transit problems in every metropolitan area in the Nation.

Consider also, if you will, that this measure would benefit not the privately owned commuter railroads in the 24 metropolitan areas of the Nation. According to its terms it would provide funds only to publicly owned mass transit facilities and would be available in every municipality of 2,500 or more. There are 6,000 such communities. This would seem to be a perfect tool for the Federal Government to take over direct control of a vital service of almost every municipality in the Nation.

Of course, the figure of \$500 million in this Federal bill is completely unrealistic. It is reliably estimated that Federal expenditures would amount to \$10 to \$15 billion in the next few years—if this bill is enacted. Indeed, this proposed urban mass transportation program would dwarf any existing Federal subsidy program enacted so far, including the huge agricultural subsidy program which has plagued our Nation since its first modest enactment back in 1933 with an appropriation of \$3 million and which amounted last year to approximately \$5 billion.

No one can question the importance of our great metropolitan areas to the welfare of the Nation as a whole. Still, Members of Congress representing States such as Nebraska, Idaho, Nevada, and North Dakota may wonder why their taxpayers should be called upon to finance local transportation for those far-removed individuals residing in and about our great cities.

Is the failure or refusal of our State and local governments to provide legislation favoring mass transit facilities justification for tapping the Federal Treasury again? The interstate aspects of mass transit in the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut area are not reasons for the failure of the local and State Governments to provide interstate arrangements. Indeed, this has been accomplished significantly with respect to such complex subjects as ferry service, tunnels, and bridges constructed under the authority of the multi-State New York Port Authority.

Underlying this and other subjects involving new Federal spending programs is the effect of additional Federal obliga-

tions at a time when a reduction in taxes has been enacted in the hope of promoting a healthy domestic economy. This presents an inevitable dilemma in which the greatest possible public support is required to discourage the Congress from inaugurating new Federal spending programs while a serious attempt is being made to reduce the existing load on the overburdened taxpayer.

In my opinion, the Congress will be responding to the public will by rejecting this legislation. Unless a specific new source of Federal revenue to offset this enormous outlay can be found and unless other equities are presented, there appears to be no logical basis for me to support such a mass transit measure.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DEL CLAWSON].

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Chairman, the foundation for the structure of strength and virility that is our urban society is centered in the American community. Long before the establishment of the Federal Government—during decades of expansion and colonization by European countries, each vying for power and position in the new world—our cities were emerging, building for the future, providing the many and varied services needed for an industrial community. The forming of such a society required the vision, wisdom, and hard work of men laboring together within the framework of a few ground rules wherein the freedom of the marketplace for both labor and goods was clearly established.

The controlled society, the oppression of centralized government and its attendant restrictions upon the individual exercise of conscience and decision had been left behind—our cities were unshackled, free to grow and develop, and, as they expanded, as industries, factories, businesses, and services multiplied, our cities constructed streets, sidewalks, sewers, water systems, parks, public libraries, recreation centers, utility systems, schools, colleges, churches, hospitals—they provided fire protection, police services, health facilities, sanitation safeguards, garbage pickup and disposal—they developed zoning patterns for the protection and separation of this complexity in living, working, and relaxation. Cultural centers, convention halls, financial districts, industrial complexes, multiple-unit housing, harbors, railroads, shipping facilities, yes, even transportation systems for the movement of its people within the metropolitan area were designed, constructed, and operated without benefit and in many instances before the establishment of a Federal Government.

This was accomplished with our private institutions and the private sector of the economy taking the lead, and meeting the challenge. The challenge brought improvement and progress.

Urban growth brought increased demands for public services. The broadened tax base and new sources of tax revenue stimulated the local jurisdictions. New ideas of providing these services with self-liquidating bonds, permitting the fare box and the fee window to meet the financial obligations began

to unfold. The problems of today and those that will arrive on the horizon of tomorrow are no greater in degree than were those of the past, when we consider the ability of man and the technological advances of the last century at his command.

Mass rapid transit is only one of a multitude of local problems. The nature of its complexity, the variety of local forms the problem assumes across the Nation should make it, certainly, no more vulnerable to Federal intervention and attention. From my 12 years in local government and 7 years as mayor of my home city, a great metropolitan area, it is my opinion that the Federal Government has penetrated its way into so many local functions that the States, counties, and cities could become, in the foreseeable future, mere hollow shells and agencies of Federal bureaucracy. Those of us who are willing to allow the Federal agencies to drive their relentless inroads into the hearts of our local affairs have little faith in the real greatness of our Nation, those citizens who live and work in our cities.

From the past we learn the lessons of the present and view the prospects for the future. Our local governments have demonstrated their ability to meet, head on, the issues of the day. And, from the pages of history, as I read them, they have done a better job in many respects than has the Federal Government. Over the centuries of history our cities have borne the burden of providing public services. Central governments have come and gone—buried with the dead past. But the local communities survive and thrive. No central government in the world today can compare in age with even some of the newest of our cities. Next to the family, the community is the fundamental foundation unit of society and derives its strength from meeting and solving its own problems just as does the family.

Even in this so-called critical situation, the community will weather the storms of adversity and frustration, even the present threat to its autonomy.

Mr. Chairman, America's strength is in her local entities, and her communities are strong because they have had to develop public muscle in dealing with the multiplicity of demands made by their citizens. These same citizens have the inherent right and responsibility to continue to meet these demands without the interference nor the direct assistance of the Federal Government. Mass rapid transit is only one of a multitude of local problems. Let us permit our cities, States, and counties to continue to deal effectively with these local situations. By far the most beneficial action that could be taken by this Congress would be the release of revenue sources to the States and local governments, thereby gaining in both total dollars and efficiency through the elimination of the Federal brokerage fee, the imposition of expensive controls and conditions, and by allowing the people to maintain a powerful and influential voice in the conduct of their own affairs.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, my support of H.R. 3881, approved by the House Banking and Currency Committee, is evidenced by the fact that I introduced a bill early in the first session of this Congress, H.R. 1960, which closely parallels the bill now before the House.

H.R. 3881 is designed to assist State and local agencies, not only in planning mass transportation facilities and developing improved equipment, techniques, and methods, but also in financing areawide coordinated systems by means of grants and loans.

While this measure will provide Federal financial assistance to States and local agencies in improving and extending urban mass transportation systems, planning at the local level and coordination of areawide transportation are prerequisites for Federal aid. Areawide planning and research are essential to long-term solutions of urban transportation problems. They will be stimulated by the legislation under consideration by its provisions for research, development, and demonstration programs. The cost of the program will be modest—\$500 million spread over a period of 3 years.

Historically there is precedent for Federal assistance to transportation without Federal infringement on the sovereignty of the separate States. No one segment of the transportation industry, or single level of government, can absorb the total responsibility for providing efficient movement of people and goods. The cooperative efforts of all are needed. H.R. 3881 emphasizes the role of the State and local agencies in providing for grants and loans to be made under prescribed conditions to public bodies rather than directly to private transportation companies or agencies.

Indicative of the basic soundness of the proposed legislation is the requirement of maximum financing of a particular project from service revenues. Another significant provision is the prohibition of use of Federal funds, to be made available by the measure, for operating expenses. That is, no operating subsidies would be provided.

Several authoritative studies of urban transportation as an important economic factor in area development have stressed the need for sound planning of transportation as part of overall metropolitan planning to assure the most efficient utilization of all facilities to incorporate all modes of transport into an integrated system, where each form supplements and complements the others. Each region has its own unique characteristics and problems; transportation facilities must be tailored to fit the peculiar needs of each. Substitution of one form of transport for another is no solution; different modes perform different functions.

But, transportation systems must not be devised in a vacuum. They must be placed within the framework of all other urban planning and programing. Trans-

portation must be an integral part of comprehensive land use and community development for whole urban areas or regions. One purpose of H.R. 3881 is to encourage coordination of plans and co-operation among the several political jurisdictions which are often involved. We have metropolitan areas but no "metropolitan government."

No blueprint can be devised which will cover all situations or be applicable in all communities. Therefore, the provisions of this bill are directed toward assisting the States and local bodies in evolving a coordinated transportation system which will be applicable to conditions in their respective communities. Rigid formulas would be useless in view of the rapidly changing character of the urban areas and the shifting population. Thus, the proposed method of assistance is most practicable because the State and local agencies to which financial assistance is to be given are in the best position to keep abreast of, perhaps even to anticipate, trends which indicate necessity for specific transportation facilities which will contribute to rather than hinder progress.

Despite the existence of one of the most highly developed and diversified transportation systems in the world, public transportation in the United States has not kept pace with the growth and increasing needs of urban areas. These metropolitan areas are the backbone of our national strength. Their continued growth and consequent contribution to the national economy depend on adequate transportation systems within the areas as well as between them. Common carrier service has continued to decline in recent years, though some 40 percent of our population is dependent upon public transportation.

Congestion and inadequate urban transportation are a burden to the national economy. Loss of time, added fuel consumption, et cetera, because of traffic congestion add to the cost of moving goods through metropolitan areas and hence to prices paid by the consumer for these goods.

The need for a balanced transportation system which will assure transportation facilities for all segments of the population, improve traffic flow, and meet the total urban needs at minimum cost to the economy is clearly indicated. All transportation programs, urban renewal projects, and urban planning assistance programs will become more effective with the passage of H.R. 3881. This legislation will not solve all our transportation problems but, hopefully, it will expedite implementation of farsighted, rational methods to deal with these problems.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3881, which, in my judgment, may well be a latter-day Magna Carta for millions of Americans who day after day are hopelessly trapped in traffic jams during the morning and evening rush hours. This is the first time that a concerted effort is being made to help urban areas and rural areas of this country to develop a com-

prehensive transportation system which can provide adequate transportation for its people.

I should like to join in congratulating the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] for preparing this legislation and sponsoring it. This may well become one of the most important bills ever passed by our Congress. I am also very happy to see that this bill is being moved on a bipartisan basis. Certainly our cities throughout the country are usually oriented along Democratic lines and our suburbs along Republican lines. This bill would help these metropolitan areas, regardless of political considerations or geographic determinations, to develop systems to serve the whole area. I think that those who oppose this legislation fail to recognize that it is in the suburbs of America that the greatest need for adequate mass transportation exists today.

We in Chicago are intensely interested in this legislation. We ask our colleagues from rural areas to recognize that 78 percent of the Nation's population lives in urban areas today. Metropolitan Chicago alone is the heart today of an industrial complex which, by 1970, will serve a population of 10½ million people. These people have to be moved to and from their work. I say that the traffic situation which exists in our transit systems across the country today is perhaps one of the most serious drags on our economy. I think it is actually cruel to expect American working people to spend almost 2 hours a day, an hour in the morning and an hour in the evening, and in many instances much longer than that, trapped in a car going to and from their work. For this reason, we certainly hope that this Congress will recognize that transportation is the very lifeline of our development and existence.

Much has been said here about local effort. This is no handout. This is no Federal handout. This legislation requires that local communities must make a one-third contribution toward development of their systems. We in Chicago have a Chicago Transit Authority which, I think, is one of the finest transit systems in the world. It was established many years ago. The Chicago Transit Authority today has to retire its bonds and maintain a depreciation fund. The Chicago Transit Authority is caught today in this hopeless situation where they cannot raise fares any higher because with every increase in fares, obviously, the volume of passengers declines. You can make public transportation so expensive that it no longer remains in the public domain. So the Chicago Transit Authority quite properly looks to this legislation for assistance in developing, through my own district, a \$40 million rapid transit system in the median strip of the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Expressway. If this legislation is approved, Chicago could start on extending the Logan Square elevated in the median strip of the expressway very shortly and have the job completed in about 2 years. An effort has been made by local communities but they have now reached the very maximum of their ability. The Chicago

Transit Authority has tried many ways to raise the money but could not. Unless the CTA gets some help from outside, it just cannot get off the pad in expanding its system. For that reason we hope that this legislation will be approved. We had an experiment just recently in Chicago's North Side suburbs.

The Chicago Transit Authority developed the Skokie Swift. This has surpassed all expectations in volume of traffic. The Chicago Transit Authority itself had never expected the volume that the Skokie Swift is now carrying. The response of the people to an adequate transit system was immediate and enthusiastic. For this reason I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that not to approve this legislation indeed makes a mockery of our whole Federal Defense Highway System. You can take any expressway in any city in America during the early morning rush hours or the early evening rush hours and you see thousands upon thousands of cars hopelessly trapped on these highways. We make a mockery out of the \$50 billion that we spent in developing this Defense Highway System when the very core of the system in large cities is inoperative during heavy traffic. This legislation complements the money we have already invested in the Federal highway system so that we can move people by mass transit means without requiring them to use the roadways.

Mr. Chairman, I hope Congress will approve the bill.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply sympathetic with the needs of the big cities in this country. I have experienced some of the problems of commuting in Atlanta, New York, Dallas, San Francisco. Even so, I would like to point out just a couple of facts in relation to the figures that were brought out by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Rains] when he submitted that 78 or 79 percent of all taxes are paid by the citizens of the metropolitan areas and that therefore this is a national problem. I think he is proving the case for the defense, when he states that they are paying these taxes, because we also have to remember that three-fourths of this Nation's wealth and productive capabilities are concentrated in these same areas.

We have all this wealth already existent in the major metropolitan areas. Why do they have to turn to the small rural taxpayer for relief of their problem? Why have they not been able to solve their problems already?

It seems to me a little incredible that we should have to come to the Congress of the United States within a few weeks after passing a \$11 billion tax cut and offer a \$500 million bill as an extra burden upon the Nation's taxpayers to subsidize the citizens of the richest areas of the Nation.

This legislation we are discussing touches basically about 8 to 15 metropolitan areas. They would receive the vast bulk of the money. We have heard about the traffic congestion in the city of Chicago, in Atlanta, and in New York.

I think it is pertinent to point out that in Chicago, for example, the actual amount of traffic leaving the central business district daily declined 2,000 per day between 1950 and 1961. That is, there are less people leaving Chicago daily with the new facilities that they have, this magnificent subway and the outstanding transit authority that they have—and I compliment them on it, and the magnificent freeways that have been created—the fact still remains that in Chicago, Ill., there has been a reduction in the actual amount of traffic in their business district over the past 11 years. This is just a single instance, but the same situation is true all across the country.

In Detroit the level went down from 78,000 per day in 1944 to 73,000 in 1953. In Los Angeles, in Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Minneapolis, Washington and New York City, the story is the same. The central business district in these areas is not growing simply because the ring city concept is taking effect. The ring city concept exists because it is an advantage to be in the suburbs, people are moving there, they have put their businesses and their homes there. We cannot reverse a pattern that people are establishing because of their own desires. We cannot tell people that they have to ride a bus or train simply because we want them to ride a bus or a train.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is pertinent to point out that when we look at these large metropolitan areas which are not experiencing an increase in traffic in and out of the downtown business districts, that a study was made of eight of these major areas, including Atlanta, Ga. Parenthetically it was interesting to hear the Representative from Atlanta say that they of all people had to have this Federal help. The cost of the program for Atlanta proper is estimated at \$59 million. The total amount of Federal help would only be \$4 million additional. That is not a substantial amount of Federal aid to be talking about.

Mr. Chairman, the point is that out of eight cities which have a total program cost of \$269 million, four cities in the United States, Los Angeles, New York, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco, would take 86 percent of the total funds expended.

Mr. Chairman, back during the committee hearings we had the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, Mr. Symes, testify before our committee. Mr. Symes made a rather interesting point. He said:

We have to compete not only with trucks, highways, and automobiles, but also with the airlines.

He said, for example, if they got the same subsidy that Allegheny Airlines received—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. BROCK. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I wonder if my colleague is overlooking section 12 about the

limitation of 12½ percent that any one State can receive?

Mr. BROCK. No; I am not, Mr. Chairman. I am talking about the projected cost of these eight cities. I am not talking about the overall program in that context.

But, Mr. Chairman, back to the Pennsylvania Railroad, the chairman of the board said if they just got the same subsidy per passenger mile that Allegheny Airlines got, they would receive \$40 million per year in additional revenue.

I asked Mr. Symes:

What would you save if you had the work rules in effect that you have asked for, if you were given the right of free collective bargaining without Federal intervention?

He said, "\$500 million." I said, "How much would the Pennsylvania Railroad save?" He said, "\$40 million."

The point I would like to make is that if the Federal Government would remove present strangling regulations instead of putting its hand further into meddling with collective bargaining and with free enterprise, perhaps we would have an opportunity to have decent commuter facilities, an opportunity to compete, and an opportunity to operate with efficiency. We cannot do this if we are going to impose another Federal control, another Federal program on top of the incredible hamstringing already existent. Why impose another program which is going to cost 4 percent at the Federal level, when the local communities could borrow the money at 3½ to 3¼ percent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for yielding me this time at this hour to speak before this large and enthusiastic gathering on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of talk about the great cities and the effect of this legislation on the great cities of our land.

Mr. Chairman, I do not happen to live in a great city. I live in a rural area. I live in a little town called Riverhead. We grow ducks out on Long Island, and in Riverhead right now there are probably more ducks than people. We are 80 miles from the island of Manhattan. Long Island is 150 miles long, and it happens to have 7 million people on it. It has 14 Congressmen. I represent the easterly half of the island, and the other 13 represent the westerly half of the island. So, I do not think I have to prove that mine is a rural area.

Mr. Chairman, my feeling about the city of New York is the same as that of a great many other people. It is a nice place to visit, but I really do not want to live there. However, I would like to be able to visit it in convenience once in a while.

Mr. Chairman, you know we built a Long Island Expressway with Federal funds. But before the rural end can be completed, the urban end is so clogged with traffic it does not matter whether we complete the rural end or not.

Mr. Chairman, we are building roads and more roads. The westerly end of Long Island is becoming a vast mass of concrete. However, we cannot build enough roads to solve this problem. Everyone recognizes the existence of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, those who oppose this bill do not say there is not any problem. They say "do not do it this way," or "do not do it now," "let the States do it," or "let the cities do it."

I do not happen to think that the Governor of the State of New York enjoys the traffic strangulation of the highways in the State of New York, and if he thought there was some easy way of solving this problem he would have done something about it, and I believe he would have liked to have done something about it.

As I said at the beginning, Mr. Chairman, we raise a lot of ducks on eastern Long Island. We raise chickens, and we raise turkeys. One thing which we do not have, however, is ostriches. It would take an ostrich to believe that there is no crisis in mass transportation on Long Island. It would take an ostrich to believe that new efforts were not urgently needed to solve this crisis.

More than half a century ago, my father worked for the Long Island Rail Road, and recently, among his effects, I found a timetable more than 50 years old which showed that mass transit was more efficient on Long Island than than it is today.

I would hate to have my own children say, 50 years from now, that mass transit was better in 1964 than it is in their time because we, in our generation, looked the other way and ignored this problem.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate for the better part of the afternoon and have been totally unimpressed by the arguments for the legislation now before us.

It merely bears out the fact that regardless of what problem exists at the local, State, or even private level, there are those who seem to think that the only solution rests with the Federal Government. Grabbing for Federal funds has consequently become a national pastime.

In my own district, which happens to be a suburban area, I have not had a single request from a commuter for support of this legislation. Who do the letters come from? Where is the force of support coming from? Well, from all of those who will benefit either directly or indirectly from the Federal subsidy. Hence, they ask that we get Uncle Sam into a project wherein the Federal Government has no jurisdiction or authority. It is strictly a local problem.

All afternoon we have heard proponents of this bill talk about how nice it is to get folks to work on time. I am in favor of that. In fact one went so far as to say that this is a bill to determine whether or not we intend to preserve the beauty of the cities of this Nation. I can assure you we will have beautiful or ugly cities whether this bill

passes or not, and whether or not the private or local folks meet their responsibility.

I can understand why Members from the city areas would support this bill. Because those of us in the suburbs realize that it is both understandable and advantageous for them to have a transit system and to keep improving the transit system which would to some degree stunt or stem the economic growth in the suburban areas. But just as water seeks its own level, so do economic factors determine the course of economic centralization or decentralization of economic facilities, business or industrial.

We have seen in the past 15 or 20 years a tremendous growth in the suburban areas. We have also seen the movement of industry from the large cities into the suburban areas and the growth of large shopping centers. This is a way of life that nothing is going to stem. It is a healthy condition and if these areas benefit because it is more convenient for workers and shoppers to rely less and less upon traveling "downtown" for employment, shopping, or entertainment I see no reason for Government subsidies to try and change it.

In view of the arguments we have heard up to this time, I would like to read from a letter which was written to me by the chairman of the board of a suburban Chicago transit line. Obviously he is not interested in getting his fingers into the Federal Treasury for subsidies. The author is Paul Dittmar, past president of the American Transit Association, who opposes this bill. This gentleman is undoubtedly better versed in the field of transit systems and operations than most of the Members of the House who have talked for the bill today.

He says, and I am quoting part of his communication to me:

Almost all transit companies are profitable in varying degrees, and are able to finance additions and improvements. Chicago's CTA 3½ percent revenue bonds are now selling above par.

If financial help is needed for capital improvements, the banks, investment houses, or the city or State should supply it.

Urban transit is a local concern. The Federal Government should not become involved.

It was mentioned by some of the speakers earlier today that Federal involvement in mass transportation is not new. But I find little similarity in his comparing this bill and the subsidy of the mass transportation system of waterways, airlines, railroads, and so forth, because we are speaking on the one hand of interstate commerce, where it has been constitutionally recognized that the Federal Government has jurisdiction and authority, and on the other hand we are dealing in this legislation with intrastate commerce. The latter properly has been a local problem and I believe should remain so.

Mr. Dittmar incidentally also points out that:

Most Federal transit aid would go for new rail rapid transit, in spite of the fact that rail urban transit has been a colossal failure for the last four decades. Rails for commuter transit service have been ripped up almost everywhere. Passengers have abandoned rail transit.

So I say to you today that I fear if this legislation is passed we are merely getting the Federal Government into an area where it does not properly belong, and that this might well be another one of those steps in the direction of "improving" the country to death.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population.

The joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 1055

Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"ARTICLE XXV

"SECTION 1. Nothing in the Constitution of the United States shall prohibit a State, having a bicameral legislature, from apportioning the membership of one house of its legislature on factors other than population, if the citizens of the State shall have the opportunity to vote upon the apportionment.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

On June 15, 1964, the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the sovereign States of the Union do not have the authority or the right to apportion one house of their legislatures on the basis of factors other than population alone.

The Court declared that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment requires that the States compose both bodies of their legislatures so that every member of each house represents substantially the same number of people.

If legislative districts are not equal in population, so the Court contends, voters in the more heavily populated districts will suffer an unconstitutional debasement of their votes.

It has appeared to a rapidly increasing number of thoughtful citizens that the Supreme Court has begun in recent years to exceed its proper authority and usurp powers which long have been held to belong to the States or to other branches of the Federal Government. Without doubt, these most immediate decisions of the Court proceed the farthest along this wayward path and do the most harm to the longtime concept of States rights.

Initially, the Supreme Court must be questioned for its decisions which impose a novel interpretation of the equal

protection clause of the 14th amendment.

The 14th amendment was introduced, discussed, and passed by the Congress, and ratified by the States as a single unit. Its sections must be interpreted together and not split apart to stand alone in meaning. History reveals that from its inception, the 14th amendment was never intended to prevent a State from choosing any legislative structure it believes best suited to its needs. During the debate on the amendment in the House, it was concisely stated that the amendment "takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it." Of the 23 Northern States which ratified the amendment before 1870, 5 had constitutional provisions for apportionment of at least one house of the legislature without regard to population. Ten others, while giving emphasis to population, called for the consideration of other traditional principles of apportionment. Furthermore, of the 10 reconstructed States of the former Confederacy, which were required to ratify the amendment before readmission to the Union, the constitutions of 6 of them contained provisions which would not have withstood the manner of apportionment now presented by the Supreme Court.

The policy of apportioning one body of a State legislature on factors other than population long preceded the enactment of the 14th amendment. The obvious reason why the proponents of that amendment had no thought or intention of changing the established system may be traced to the conditions that existed early in our country's history. Long before the establishment of the Government of the United States, Colonial States existed. These States were composed of legislatures which had one or more bodies made up of members who were selected by means other than population alone. The drafters of the Federal Constitution were in agreement that the political rights of the States should be preserved if the people of the States agreed to form a Union. To this end, the "Great Compromise" was achieved. In order to safeguard the rights of the smaller States and to grant them an equal voice in the Union, the Senate of the United States was to be composed of two Members selected by the people of each State. The weight and importance of the large States was to be insured through the House of Representatives. But, the rights and safeguards of the lesser States were to be protected in the Senate by equal representation, without regard to population.

The analogy to the legislatures of the States may be closely drawn. Not only did all of the original States have legislatures in which at least one body was selected on factors other than population, but the drafters of the Constitution recognized the value of this plan and clearly intended that no action of the Federal Government should overturn it. Perhaps, it is true, as the Supreme Court suggests, that counties or other local units of government are not sovereign bodies in the same manner that States are, and that, therefore, the theory of the "compromise" does not apply to

them. But, this argument seems specious and completely disregards the primary reason for establishing a bicameral legislative system.

The "Great Compromise" was not worked out because theoreticians determined that sovereignty demanded the equal representation of States in one body of Congress. Instead, it was devised because practical men of infinite wisdom in planning and creating the best form of government ever devised by men, believed that factors other than population alone should determine the strength of the voice of States, regardless of wealth or size.

The same reasoning applies to State government and it has been the case since before the adoption of our Constitution. There are now 50 States in the Union, each with separate characteristics. Within each State, a wide range of local characteristics exist involving unique history, geography, topography, climate, distribution of population, political heritage, and individual citizen's economic, political, and social interests.

Counties, or similar units of local government, are generally the largest autonomous political units in a State. Their functions and responsibilities are normally of great significance. Law enforcement and judicial functions, bridges and highways, systems of education and transportation, administration of welfare and recreational programs, and agricultural and business matters are among the many duties, to a greater or lesser extent, that fall upon or must be maintained by counties.

It is correct to say, as the Supreme Court does, that legislators represent people, not trees or acres. But, the people who reside in States are not mere numbers. They are people with dissimilar and sometimes conflicting needs, with conflicting hopes and aspirations, with ever-changing problems that sometimes fail to yield to computer logic. Through the wisdom of the people themselves, as represented by the elected leaders of sovereign States, they may well decide that there is a need for representation of particular interests in one body of a legislature in contrast to the representation of general interests in the other body.

Some people may live in areas of high employment, others in depressed areas with high unemployment. Some may be lumbermen, miners, fishermen or farmers. Some may be of one religion or national origin peculiar in need or consideration from those of another religion or national origin. Some may live in rural areas or small towns while others live in metropolitan areas or suburban expanses. Some may direct their needs toward secondary roads or superhighways while others are more concerned about rapid transit systems. Some may require priority consideration of irrigation projects while others demand consideration of water systems.

Between each group, conflicting interests of varying degree develop, with each conflict producing a majority and a minority. Certainly, the majority must have effective rule, but the minority, too, is entitled to effective representation lest

important segments of our people be completely subject to the tyranny of a temporary majority. The enactment of the civil rights laws has clearly demonstrated the truth of this proposition. Abandonment of this concept will most certainly convert our system of government, the oldest constitutional government in the world, to something alien thereto and potentially dangerous to individual liberty.

To authorize both houses of a legislature to be apportioned on the basis of local need or selected interest would, of course, be unfair and inimical to the general public interest. But, by the same token, the requirement that both houses be apportioned strictly on population alone would amount to a desertion of the rights of the minority and to a cavalier abandonment of the unique needs of the individual citizen. If the latter concept is to stand, how soon will come the frontal assault on article I, section 3 of the Federal Constitution?

For these reasons, I have introduced a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States so that States having a bicameral legislature, may apportion one house on the basis of factors other than population. In so providing, however, the citizens of the State shall have the opportunity to vote upon such apportionment.

The Supreme Court calls for apportionment on the theory of "one man, one vote." A slogan, of course, cannot be a proper substitute for logic and in all likelihood it will not, for long, guard individual rights. As discussed above, apportionment according to population must be tempered by other considerations of equal importance. But, in so doing, it is necessary to permit all qualified people of a State to vote upon plans of apportionment, so that the rights of the majority cannot be seriously or unfairly impaired.

The Supreme Court probably was correct in striking down the apportionment in one house of the Tennessee Legislature in the case of Baker against Carr. There, reapportionment had not taken place in more than 60 years, in violation of State constitutional provisions. And the people of that State had little or no means to initiate or vote upon a plan of reapportionment. On the other hand, a great many of the States, by constitutional authority, provide the means whereby every qualified citizen may vote on the apportionment provisions of their constitutions. The Supreme Court could have issued a narrow decision in the Baker case, specifically related to the unique facts and circumstances therein, without doing harm to the whole concept of State sovereignty. Yet, with regrettable frequency, in recent years the Court seems to be assuming the role of elected officials and taking up the mace of the lawmakers. By such unwarranted action the Supreme Court invites increasing public distrust and rebuke. Abraham Lincoln once said:

The candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in

ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal.

I earnestly request every Member of Congress to study the decisions of the Supreme Court on this momentous issue, and I cordially invite those, who are inclined to do so, to join with me in presenting the proposals to the appropriate committee of the House, and to the House itself.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill which I have joined in sponsoring to provide additional Federal assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated systems of urban mass transportation.

American cities have had an extraordinary transportation burden thrust upon them in recent years. During the last five decades the percentage of our rapidly growing population living in urban areas has increased from 46 percent to more than 70 percent. And this growth and concentration is continuing with gathering speed.

Furthermore, while automobile production has kept pace with this urban explosion, municipal transportation systems have lagged far behind. Thus the all-too-familiar scene in cities across our country today is the bumper to bumper, crablike inching of traffic and the desperate search for parking.

Highways have, and will continue, of course, to play a major role in facilitating transportation. But it has become increasingly clear that there is one mammoth problem which they alone cannot hope to meet, except at prohibitive cost. This is the problem of morning and evening rush hour travel from home to work. It is the problem of the 20-hour-a-week rush hour need that has forced the allocation of \$20 billion of the \$41 billion interstate program for urban highway construction.

Mr. Chairman, in their excellent report 2 years ago to the President, following a comprehensive study of urban transportation, Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges and Dr. Robert Weaver of the Housing and Home Finance Agency stated that:

The major objectives of urban transportation policy are the achievement of sound land-use patterns, the assurance of transportation facilities for all segments of the population, the improvement in overall traffic flow, and the meeting of total urban transportation needs at minimum cost. Only a balanced transportation system can attain these goals, and in many urban areas this means an extensive mass transportation network fully integrated with the highway and street system.

Based on the experience of the loan and demonstration programs initiated 2 years ago, Dr. Weaver has reported further that major capital expenditures for mass transportation cannot be supported entirely from the fare box; that a public contribution will be necessary if most large, and many smaller urban areas as well, are to provide the kind

of mass transportation required for their healthy growth.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is of great importance to the Seventh California District which I represent, and to the entire metropolitan area surrounding San Francisco Bay. And this importance highlights the vast benefits this legislation holds for countless American cities.

For more than a decade now, citizens from the cities surrounding San Francisco Bay have been conducting the kind of intensive and comprehensive local planning which this bill seeks to inspire. They have conducted extensive studies designed to produce what can be the most modern and efficient rapid transit system in the world. They have, using local taxes, created and supported an effective public regional agency which can build and operate this system. Two years ago they voted \$792 million in general obligation bonds to finance construction of a 75-mile rapid transit system. And just this last week the test track was dedicated by President Johnson.

Where there is such local effort, Federal financial participation becomes an investment in the future of a local area—not a grant. It is an investment which helps a local area help itself prepare for the future. It is an investment, in brief, which I believe will pay rich dividends to the productive development of a vibrant and growing metropolitan area.

But, Mr. Chairman, the San Francisco-Oakland-Berkeley Bay area should not be penalized for its initiative in the apportionment of Federal funds. The fact that it has already passed a general obligation bond issue should not under any interpretation preclude it from benefits made available under this legislation to other metropolitan areas.

Rather, this type of initiative should be encouraged. For to deprive the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District of benefits available to other cities and urban areas would be an endorsement by Congress of the proposition that metropolitan areas should do nothing to help themselves obtain improved transit facilities; that they should sit back and let the Federal Government do the whole job.

This bill, if enacted into law, could shorten the construction period of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit System by 3½ years; from 8½ to 5 years. It could result in savings on interest and inflation costs totaling as much as \$175 million. It would speed considerably the time when meaningful extensions could be made to this system, and I am confident that similar savings and advantages could be achieved, under this legislation, by many other urban areas throughout our country.

Mr. Chairman, this mass transportation legislation offers us an opportunity for effective attack on one of the serious and persistently troublesome problems confronting our Nation's urban areas. It utilizes an approach which takes full advantage of local initiative and local responsibility. I urge that it be approved and implemented without further delay.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, on page 14723 of the June 23, 1964, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is Executive Communication No. 2199, announcing that the Export-Import Bank, a financial institution owned entirely by the U.S. Government, has issued its credit guarantee for a \$760,000 sale of cotton to the Communist Government of Hungary.

This is in compliance with a provision in title III of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1964 and pursuant to a determination made by President Johnson on February 4, 1964, that such credit guarantees to the Hungarian government, the Soviet Union and certain other Communist governments are in the national interest.

This provision became a part of title II only after a long legislative battle that ended on Christmas Eve. It gave Congress and the public assurance of prompt announcement if and when the resources of the U.S. taxpayers are used to help finance the Communists. As the result of President Johnson's determination of February 4, the taxpayers are now helping to finance the Hungarian Communist Government.

If it had not been for this provision of title III, this aid to the Communists might never have come to light—certainly not as promptly as was the case today.

The announcement is especially timely, as the 1965 Foreign Aid Appropriation Act is nearly ready for House consideration. Let us hope that the House will insist once more on this wise provision.

It is a sad day when the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD publishes official notice that the U.S. taxpayers are backing credit guarantees for the same Communist regime that crushed the Hungarian freedom uprising in October, 1956. It would be a day even sadder if this information had been kept from the eyes of the taxpayers.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. The bill H.R. 3881 reported over a year ago, on April 9, 1963, by the House Banking and Currency Committee, is a measure which will provide Federal financial assistance to States and localities in improving and extending urban mass transportation systems. It requires at the local level planning and coordination of areawide transportation as a prerequisite for Federal aid and provides for a research, development, and demonstration program. Areawide

planning and research are certainly essential to long-term solution of our urban transportation problems, and this bill will provide a needed stimulus to such planning.

In recent years Federal aid has been focused to a major extent on one mode of transportation, the automobile. Although our \$41 billion interstate highway program is essential and has produced great benefits, it has also aggravated problems for cities from New York to Los Angeles. It is a well-known fact that as highways are built to solve one congestion problem, another often develops. People are encouraged to use their cars to drive into the cities by the existence of better and faster roads. This creates parking and traffic problems in the center of the cities. In this respect, the problems of the city with which I am most familiar, New York, are acute. A former director of the New York Office of Transportation has commented that a horse-drawn truck traveling around New York City in 1910 averaged 11 miles per hour while today a motor vehicle in the heart of the city cannot average 6 miles per hour. This seems to indicate that in congested areas the automobile has limits as a fast and efficient means of transportation. There is simply a limit to the number of automobiles that can be poured into a given area without destroying the usefulness of the automobile. There is also a limit to the amount of space in a given area which can be devoted to roads and parking garages without curtailing the area's assets as an economic and cultural center. Since the automobile takes up three times as much space as the office space necessary for one person, the more automobiles the less room for people—and great cities are made up of great aggregations of people, not automobiles.

Recognizing this, the New York City Planning Commission vetoed, in 1961, a \$57 million program to provide 10,000 additional parking places in midtown Manhattan. The commission explained:

New parking garages in the midtown core would attract many commuters, business travelers, and shoppers who presently use mass transit or less convenient parking facilities. This means, in effect, not more business travelers, not more shoppers, but more automobiles.

A recent study of the transportation problem of Long Island stated that:

If present trends toward increased auto use continue, the Regional Plan Association has estimated that by 1985 there will have to be at least a doubling "of limited-access highways now in use or under construction." Moreover, if the projection that there will be a million additional automobiles registered on Long Island by 1985 is correct, some 11 square miles of parking space will be needed to park all of these cars at one time, and since parking space must be available at both ends of an automobile trip, the actual parking requirements will be greater. ("Journey to Work Report," New York State Office of Transportation, 1963.)

In the past few years, there has been a disturbing trend toward abandonment of mass transportation facilities. In the State of New York, 35 transit companies have been sold or abandoned since January 1954. Many small communities throughout the Nation are completely

without transit service of any kind. The American Transit Association has estimated that 105 localities have lost all transit service since 1954 and 79 percent were of communities of less than 50,000 population. The loss of public transportation certainly works a hardship on those citizens who do not drive and forces expensive readjustments such as the necessity for additional cars and roads. It has been estimated, for example, that if Chicago were to abandon mass transportation, an additional 600,000 automobiles would be needed, plus 160 additional expressway lanes and extensive parking facilities.

The permanent collapse of commuter rail service in Chicago, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland would require \$31 billion of new highways to handle the increased auto traffic.

This bill is a start in reversing the trend toward abandonment of mass transportation systems. It has a provision for emergency loans and grants that may be utilized by communities which face loss or curtailment of service or for some other reason need prompt aid. This provision should be a definite help in localities faced with a critical situation.

To help meet the long-range needs of our urban population, the bill requires areawide planning. Problems of mass transit faced by many of our metropolitan areas cannot be solved by one jurisdiction alone. The U.S. Conference of Mayors has stated that:

The need for joint and cooperative local, State, and Federal Government action has now been recognized as essential for the development of an adequate mass transit system in our metropolitan areas.

In the New York metropolitan area there are something like 1,400 governmental units. One body created to help solve this fragmentation of authority is the Tristate Transportation Committee. New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut work together through this committee to develop regional transportation plans. Legislation to make the work of the committee more effective by making it an interstate compact agency now awaits only action by New Jersey.

Under the terms of the bill, there is a provision for limiting any State to 12½ percent of the total Federal grant. For New York City projects, however, the three States could pool their eligibility and obtain up to 37½ percent of the total grant funds. Projects most likely to be considered under this arrangement would involve commuter railroads. The need for improvement of this type of transit is well recognized. The steam commuter trains from Norwalk, Conn., in 1893 took 61 minutes to get to New York. In 1963 the timetable shows it takes at least 60 minutes with an electric locomotive.

Railroads complain that they cannot make money on their commuter service. In the Tristate metropolitan region the commuter railroads are piling up deficits every year. Yet if the railroads could increase and improve their commuter services to the city, congestion on highways and perhaps on subways would be decreased. Railroads remain an impor-

tant part of the overall transportation network.

The Tri-State Transportation Committee under the present demonstration grant authority included in the urban renewal program has obtained grants for several demonstration projects. One project consists of testing equipment at two stations of the Long Island Rail Road with the object of speeding up passenger flow. The equipment is designed for automatic fare collection and ticket validation. Another project is an experimental bus-train relay for commuters which tripled passenger volume in its first 6 months of service.

H.R. 3881 would enlarge the scope of the demonstration program. A research, development and demonstration program would be authorized for all phases of urban mass transportation. The unobligated balance of the present \$25 million authorization plus up to \$30 million of the total \$500 million grant authority would be available to finance projects. This would spur needed research by Tri-State and similar agencies. It is only by such research that we can explore new approaches to solving our urban transportation problems.

Some 70 percent of the population of the United States today live in urban areas. Both our population and the percentage living in urban areas is expected to increase in the years ahead, creating additional pressures on our transportation facilities. The New York metropolitan region study projected 24 million people and 9½ million jobs in the New Jersey, New York, Connecticut metropolitan region in 1985. Even now New York City has more people than there are farmers in the entire country.

The cost of the program proposed in this bill is modest. Total funds authorized would be \$500 million over 3 years. Maximum funds available to the State of New York would be \$62.5 million. Compare this to the cost of the proposed expressway across lower Manhattan which has been estimated at costing up to \$100 million a mile. It has also been estimated that the Federal Government will spend over \$16 million for highways in urban areas before the Interstate System is completed in about 10 years.

Under the interstate and defense highway program, the Federal Government contributes up to nine-tenths of the money; under the terms of this bill local funds will be required for one-third of the net project cost.

Mr. Chairman, surely we can afford to spend \$500 million to encourage the development of integrated, efficient urban transportation systems. This bill will not solve our mass transportation problems, but it should be an important impetus to coping with these problems in a farsighted, rational way.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, local problems require local solutions. Government closest to the people is best.

Adopting Federal programs like this mass transit subsidy substitutes rather than supplements local and satisfactory solutions to the problems.

The cost of mass transit is too great for Federal financing. The peculiar problems of localities, that is, the cities and urban areas, are too diverse and specific to permit blanket solutions by superior Federal programs. Local problems need local administration, local jurisdiction, local planning and control. Federal aid requires Federal guidelines, planning and control which nullify and contradict local needs and local control.

In answer to how best to provide local transportation, to finance the cost, to set the fares, to plan and administer, in each case the answer is local, not Federal, that provides the best solution.

I join with those members of the Banking and Currency Committee who joined in the minority report. I commend them and share their views.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time, and ask that the bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963".

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Moss, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3881) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This letter is to tender my resignation from membership on the House Committee on Rules.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM H. AVERY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 790), as follows:

Resolved, That DAVE MARTIN, of Nebraska, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Rules.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITION TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that on tomorrow the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will call up the continuing resolution on appropriations.

WHAT ABOUT THIS FILIBUSTER?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today an editorial appearing in the Manchester Union Leader of June 19, 1964, entitled "What About This Filibuster?"

Every Member of the House should read this editorial, and I commend it to the attention of all of our citizens. This is another answer to the statements being made that the "tide is turning" against any amendment to permit prayer and Bible reading in public schools. More mail is coming in now in support of an amendment; more groups, clergymen, and organizations are joining in support every day.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, opposed even one delay on the civil rights bill in the House and the filibuster in the other body. But it is perfectly all right for him to filibuster any action to bring before the House a constitutional amendment that would permit the return of prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. Why? Because he is unalterably opposed to any amendment.

One Congressman, testifying before the Judiciary Committee, suggested a resolution to permit believers' children to remain silent for a stated period—silent prayer. The chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], remarked that it is a "good idea, and will get Congressmen off the hook."

It would appear that it is not a question of the right of the American people to have their children participate, voluntarily, in prayer or Bible reading in public schools, but a matter of political expediency to do something innocuous that would "get Congressmen off the hook."

I doubt seriously that any Member of the House, on this issue, wants to be taken off any hook. I hope that Members will sign discharge petition 3, and bring this matter to the floor as quickly as possible, and bring an end to the 2-year filibuster conducted by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

WHAT ABOUT THIS FILIBUSTER?

Representative FRANK J. BECKER, nationally recognized head of the campaign for a constitutional amendment to allow Bible reading and prayer recitation in the public schools, has warned the House and the Nation at large that time is running out and so far "we have no result" from the House Judiciary Committee's long hearings. The New York Republican is again appealing for signatures on his discharge petition to bring the issue directly to a House vote. Only 52 more signatures are needed, and to our knowledge neither of New Hampshire's Congressmen have signed the discharge petition to date.

There is a dangerous tendency by many Americans to think of the Supreme Court's prayer ban rulings as a single issue, rather than as part of a pattern. Charles E. Rice, associate professor of law at Fordham University, has shown that an honest analysis of the decisions of the past 15 years leads to the inevitable conclusion that the Supreme Court has repeatedly misinterpreted the first amendment and that one of the most disturbing elements in this trend has been the utilization by the Supreme Court of obiter dicta from previous cases as if they were fully established principles, when in reality they were peripheral, if not irrelevant to the cases.

In his book, "The Supreme Court and Public Prayer" (Fordham University Press, New York, 1964), Professor Rice expresses the belief that decisions in the Murray and Schempp cases, if they follow the pattern of the past 15 years, will open the door for future decisions that would remove from our national life every meaningful recognition of God, and make agnosticism the national religion.

We urge our readers to consider the following revealing section of the prayer ban decisions of June 17, 1963: "The test (of constitutionality) may be stated as follows: what is the purpose and the primary effect of the enactment? If either is the advancement or inhibition of religion then the enactment exceeds the scope of legislative power as circumscribed by the Constitution. That is to say that to withstand the strictures of the establishment clause there must be a secular legislative purpose and a primary effect that neither advances nor inhibits religion." Earlier the Court had declared that neither a State government nor the Federal Government "can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another."

While the concurring opinion of Justice Douglas in the Murray-Schempp cases is more all-embracing than the official decision written by Justice Clark, Professor Rice points out that Douglas "is merely articulating the logical consequences of the wayward theories endorsed by the majority of Justices." Justice Douglas, in a footnote, listed the types of financing he believes to be unconstitutional. "To mention but a few at the Federal level," Douglas enumerated: Chaplaincies in both Houses of Congress and the armed services, compulsory chapel at the service academies (now being challenged), religious services in Federal hospitals and prisons, the President's religious proclamations, use of the Bible for oaths, the availability of WPA and NYA funds to parochial schools during the depression, veterans who attended denominational schools under the GI bill of 1944, use of Federal money during

World War II to train nurses in denominational schools, the National School Lunch Act as it applies to nonpublic schools, Hospital and Survey and Construction Act of 1946 as it applied to nonpublic hospitals, the slogan "In God We Trust" used by the Treasury Department (now being challenged), the word "God" in the pledge of allegiance (now being challenged), Bible reading in the schools of the District of Columbia and religious instruction in the District's National Training School for Boys, the exemption from the Federal income tax of religious organizations (now being challenged by Mrs. Murray), postal privileges of religious organizations, Federal income tax deductions for contributions to religious groups, the deductibility of gifts and bequests to religious institutions under the Federal gift and estate tax laws.

Of course, as Justice Douglas points out, this is but a partial list of instances of religious financing which he would discontinue and declare unconstitutional. But the American people are being urged not to worry their sleepy little heads about it—and those who do worry are caustically dismissed as extremists.

[From the Brooklyn Tablet, June 18, 1964]

SUPREME COURT'S LONG STEP BACKWARD

In a dissenting opinion by Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart, Monday, a note was struck which is very timely. Objecting to the ruling of the Court outlawing the States' methods of apportioning their legislatures, Justice Stewart said:

"With all respect, I am convinced that these decisions mark a long step backward into that unhappy era when a majority of this Court were thought by many to have convinced themselves and each other that the demands of the Constitution were measured not by what it says but by their own notions of wise political theory."

What Justice Stewart states is that the Court is rewriting the Constitution. He might have added that the Court also seems to be supplanting both Houses of Congress, and seeks to regulate State matters which are not included in the Constitution.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION—A VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, aggressive atheism is one of the most formidable challenges facing the free world today. I regret to state that by all appearances the position of our State Department and the U.S. delegation to the United Nations has been one of official disinterest or awkward apathy.

I believe that as the leader of the free world and a Nation dedicated to religious freedom from the first day of its existence, the United States must speak out clearly and firmly against religious persecution everywhere in the world.

In neglecting to do so our inaction gives rise to a presumption that we are not concerned with a moral issue which cries out for justice. Our muteness does a disservice to our position as the protector of individual freedom against persecution.

We were not silent in the days of Adolf Hitler, nor in 1917 or 1898 when

tyranny sought to extend itself. Why are we silent today when the new tyranny of aggressive atheism attempts to envelop masses of civilized people all over the world? Aside from the moral question involved I feel we are failing to use what is probably our most effective and appropriate weapon against communistic propaganda.

Daily we hear assurance from Communists, both Chinese and Russian, that they are most anxious to aid the emerging and developing nations, whether in Asia, Africa, or Latin or South America. Each of these emerging and developing peoples possess deeply rooted religious or at least tribal ritualistic characteristics. Of themselves they certainly would not seek to abandon their religious backgrounds nor do we as a Nation attempt to exact religious concessions as a consideration for assistance. Yet, it may be clearly established that wherever communism has made progress it has always done so at the expense of religious freedom and with the indoctrination of atheism. It is as simple as this:

Where religion exists, freedom has flourished; where atheism has spread, freedom has died and tyranny has prevailed.

It is clearly to our advantage to point up this most important difference between the American way of freedom and Communist domination. Unless we do so, an emergent people can probably see little difference between the contending forces excepting in the amount of aid being offered.

I believe the issue of religious intolerance and persecution should be advanced in the world, using every medium and instrument for truth at our disposal.

In his encyclical "Pacem in Terris" of April 11, 1963, Pope John XXIII restated the concern of the Roman Catholic Church for the fundamental rights and duties of man. With regard to freedom of religion the encyclical observed:

Every human being has the right to honor God according to the dictates of an upright conscience, and therefore the right to worship God privately and publicly. For, as Lactantius so clearly taught: We were created for the purpose of showing to the God who bore us the submission we owe Him. We are obliged and bound by this duty to God. From this, religion itself receives its name. And on this point our predecessor of immortal memory, Leo XIII, declared: "This genuine, this honorable freedom of the sons of God, which most nobly protects the dignity of the human person, is greater than any violence or injustice. It has always been sought by the church, and always most dear to her. This was the freedom which the apologists claimed with intrepid constancy, which the apologists defended with their writings, and which the martyrs in such numbers consecrated with their blood."

And yet, this freedom still has not been secured for all mankind. In some countries of the world, Jews, Christians—Roman Catholics and other denominations—are still being persecuted for their beliefs. This is true in the Communist countries—and I will later give you some examples of the persecution of Christians in Poland and the Jews and Christians in the Soviet Union. But it is not limited to the Communist countries alone. South Vietnam and the Sudan

are among the worst violators of freedom of religion.

Thus, the 20th century, too, has its religious martyrs. But the right against religious persecution should be easier in our time than in the time of the early Christians. They were a minority fighting an uphill battle against often hostile authorities. There are centuries of history between them and us, and during these centuries man has gradually achieved a near consensus, not only on the necessity for respecting fundamental human rights, but also on the need for securing these rights through the instruments of government. The movement which began with 18th-century liberalism—the French declaration of the rights and duties of man, our own Bill of Rights—has, by the mid-20th century, broadened into international action to secure human rights. While the majority of the governments of the world have undertaken to secure and protect the fundamental freedoms of their citizens—and a number of countries have, like ours, incorporated a bill of rights in their constitutions—not all the governments in the world have yet accepted their responsibility. In South Africa, the violation is apartheid, or racial discrimination. In other countries the violation is religious persecution.

Today, however, there is a means of recourse beyond individual governments. There is recourse to the United Nations. When the founders of the United Nations created the world organization at San Francisco in 1945, they drafted a charter which incorporated the aspirations and objectives of the world community. One of these objectives was to achieve international cooperation "in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

In the early years, United Nations action in the human rights field was of a general nature, perhaps out of the necessity of laying the foundations for more specific action later. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly on December 10, 1948, contained 30 human rights articles, one of which expressed the consensus of the world community on freedom of religion—article 18:

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.

The universal declaration became the basis for further United Nations action in the human rights field.

Since 1948, the United Nations has adopted numerous declarations and conventions relating to specific human rights. Most interesting for our purposes has been recent United Nations action on racial discrimination, for United Nations action in this field could and should constitute a precedent for international action against religious persecution. The 18th general assembly, meeting in 1963, adopted a declaration on the

elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. This declaration declared that racial discrimination was an offense to human dignity which "shall be condemned as a denial of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations among nations and as a fact capable of disturbing peace and security among peoples."

Already the United Nations Security Council has taken the first steps toward implementing the declaration against racial discrimination. Just last week the Council adopted a resolution creating a committee to study the legal and practical possibilities of applying economic sanctions against South Africa to force that country to modify its racial policies. The resolution condemned South Africa's apartheid policies as "contrary to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and inconsistent with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as well as South Africa's obligations under the charter."

There is no reason why the United Nations cannot adopt the same position toward countries practicing religious persecution. In fact, in early 1964, a draft declaration on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance was adopted by the Subcommittee on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities of the Human Rights Commission. This draft is similar to the declaration on racial discrimination adopted by last year's General Assembly. The draft must now go to the Human Rights Commission, then to the Economic and Social Council, and thereafter to the General Assembly for final enactment—a process which is expected to take about 2 years—but the breakthrough in the Subcommittee is considered a significant advance in United Nations human rights deliberations. The declaration was adopted in the Subcommittee by a vote of 12 to 0, with 2 abstentions. Significantly, the two abstentions were cast by the Russian and Polish representatives, culminating intense efforts on their part to block action on the declaration. The Russian and Polish representatives obviously do not want U.N. action in the field of religious discrimination since their governments are among the worst violators of religious freedom.

Encouraging though this U.N. breakthrough on religious freedom may be, the world simply cannot wait another 2 years for international action against religious persecution. The time for the world community to act is now. The basis for international involvement has already been laid in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The precedent exists in the United Nations approach toward racial discrimination in South Africa.

Every month we delay—every week, every day, every hour—the persecution of Christians and Jews in certain parts of the world continues and is intensified. In order to impress upon you the seriousness

of the problem I shall give you numerous recent examples of the persecution of religious persons and societies in certain countries of the world.

Let us consider first the Soviet Union. The basis of religious persecution in the Soviet Union rests deep in Soviet ideology, for Soviet ideology denies the existence of a Supreme Being. Thus, from the beginning the Soviet state has been embarked on a campaign to eradicate religion from Russian life. Recently, the campaign has been intensified.

The Soviet assault on religion is a dual one: on the one hand, through propaganda and social pressure; and on the other, through administrative-organizational tactics. Massive use is made of antireligious propaganda, since the state controls all communication outlets. Magazines carry articles attacking religious observances and ridiculing believers. Antireligious propaganda is broadcast over radio and television. Christianity and Jewry are denounced in public lectures, and children are taught atheism in the schools. Frequently religious groups are accused of anti-Government activities.

In March 1964, the Communist Party's Central Committee adopted a program for intensifying the atheistic indoctrination of the population. Under this program, atheism will be offered as a field of study in universities and colleges. Indoctrination programs are to be established for party and government officials, teachers, kindergarten staffs, physicians, journalists, and others in the communications fields. But the focus of the new program will be on individual persuasion: Atheist action groups are to be set up in all cities and towns that have religious communities. Members of the action groups are to try to win the trust of believers and convert them from religion.

This is the less tangible but more insidious aspect of religious persecution in the Soviet Union. To hear one's beliefs constantly ridiculed, to stand by while one's children are daily being taught atheism in the classroom, to be aware of atheist action groups in one's midst continually trying to break down the faith of believers—this certainly is religious persecution.

But this is only part of the story in the Soviet Union. The other part—the administrative-organizational tactics of the government—includes: closing of churches, synagogues, monasteries, and seminaries; preventing believers from access to higher education and the more desirable government positions; and direct persecution through arrest and imprisonment.

The closing of churches has been accomplished by such technically legal but devious methods as forbidding priests from serving several parishes at once, and imposing impossible tax burdens. If a parish is without a priest, the church is automatically closed. Again, if a church cannot pay its tax burden—and churches are taxed over 80 percent of their revenue—it is closed. It has been estimated that some 7,500 churches, about 50 percent of all existing churches, have been closed in the last 2 years.

By 1962 the number of monasteries in the Soviet Union had been reduced by about half.

It is impossible to document fully the educational and professional discrimination against believers, but such discrimination doubtless exists on a wide scale. Prof. Vladimir S. Tolstoy of the U.S. Naval Academy has commented:

Holders of good jobs know that avowal of religious belief by attending services may mean the end of their career. Such attendance may bar the high school graduate from entrance to the university or seriously limit his choice of career and achievement of status at the university level.

An especially powerful weapon of persecution is the Government's power of arrest, court trial, and punishment. One of the tactics of the Government is to try to discredit clergymen by summoning and imprisoning them for drunkenness or other criminal acts and by widely publicizing the trial.

The following are a few examples of arrests and imprisonments: First, a Father Scherbatov was sentenced to 3 years' imprisonment for the alleged death of a child during a christening ceremony; second, in 1962 four leading Pentecostals were imprisoned, 2 for 5 years to be followed by 5 years of exile and two others to lesser terms on charges of breaking up families and seeking to entice young people to join their religious groups; third, also in 1962 five evangelists were found guilty of "parasitic idleness" and banished, probably to Siberia; fourth, a Moscow truckdriver was sentenced to 3 years in prison on charges of forcing his two small children "to pray," to wear crosses, and barring them from the pioneers.

The situation is not much better in Poland. On the surface freedom of worship exists, but the Polish people are finding it more and more difficult to exercise their religious convictions. As in the Soviet Union, the Polish Government is engaged in an active campaign to indoctrinate the people, particularly the youth, in atheistic materialism and to destroy their religious beliefs. A focal point of the government attack is religious education. The government has issued decrees attempting to regulate religious education, one of which prohibited nuns and priests deemed by the education authorities to be engaging in "antistate activity" from teaching catechism classes.

Thus, the Polish Communist attack on religion, like that in the Soviet Union, is a dual attack, through propaganda and through administrative-organizational tactics. Confiscatory taxation, sequestration of church and religious orders' properties, refusal to issue church, school, and other building permits, and interference with the internal affairs of church bodies are some of the methods used by the Polish Government.

Furthermore, any move by the church defying the Polish Communist regime is certain to provoke retaliation. An episcopal letter of June 1962 signed by Cardinal Wyszyński and all 64 bishops of the Polish Roman Catholic Church offers an example. The letter, read in every church in Poland during masses,

called upon all Christians to fast and pray that atheists would return to the faith. As soon as the Government learned of the letter it retaliated by sending military draft notices to a number of seminarians studying for the priesthood.

An intensification of the Polish Communists' campaign against the Roman Catholic Church was reported in April 1964. The methods included arrests, tax prosecutions, and land confiscation. Friction between church and state was highlighted in late May when Cardinal Wyszynski, primate of Poland, drove from Warsaw to Wierzbica, a town whose church had been closed, to conduct mass in front of a house where Catholics had been holding services. The local priest had been jailed twice during the year for undetermined reasons. The reasons for closing the church were also not known.

Another area of religious unrest is South Vietnam, where recently there has been evidence of mistreatment of Roman Catholics by the Buddhist government. In early June, 40,000 to 50,000 Catholics staged a demonstration in Saigon protesting against what they charged was favoritism of the current government toward Buddhists and unfair treatment of Catholics. The demonstrators stated that in central Vietnam priests had been beaten, churches vandalized, and Catholics spat upon in the streets of Hue, leading Buddhist center. The demonstrators asked for a new committee to protect Catholics from persecution and for the freeing of unjustly imprisoned Catholics.

Previously, on May 15 the archbishop of Saigon, Paul Nguyen van Binh, had sent letters to the Vietnamese Government leaders protesting that many Catholics had been unjustly accused and harshly mistreated since the fall of the Diem government on November 1, 1963. The archbishop's letter charged that "a good number of Catholic officials and military men have become victims of calculated actions totally unjustified. Many have been jailed only because they are Catholic." Referring specifically to Maj. Dang Sy, a young Catholic military officer who was later sentenced to life imprisonment by the Revolutionary Tribunal because his troops had fired on Buddhist demonstrators last year, the archbishop charged that he was being judged on political and religious grounds rather than on juridical. The letter observed that films, the radio, and the press were engaged in a campaign to demand Maj. Dan Sy's death and to revive hatred among the people.

During his trial Maj. Dang Sy gave a 30-minute rebuttal item by item of the prosecution's indictment. He stated that he had been held for months in a dark cell where "you could not tell day from night," and that he was offered safety if he would accuse Archbishop Thuc, brother of the late President Diem, of ordering repression of Buddhists. Maj. Dan Sy was reported to have confided to correspondents during the trial that he was guilty of two mistakes: "I am a Catholic and I executed my superior's orders." Some of the Viet-

namese newspapers publicly accused the major as guilty even before his trial opened.

Also recently in Vietnam a Chinese priest, Father Hoa, was deprived of the command of his private army and replaced by a regular Vietnamese commander. In the absence of a regular army commander in his sector, Father Hoa had been military leader as well as parish priest. His counter guerrilla tactics had been very successful against the Communists, and thus American officials were concerned at what might happen if his army was broken up. The motives for his removal were unclear, but it is known that Father Hoa was suspect among the anti-Diem forces since he was admired and supported by Diem when Diem was president.

In Europe, in Asia, in Africa too, there are examples of religious persecution. In late February 1964, for example, the Government of the Sudan ordered the deportation of all 300 missionaries, including 272 Roman Catholic and 28 Protestant missionaries, working in the southern part of the country. The deportation move followed reports of uprising in the southern province of Bahr el Ghazal, where a man recently executed as the leader of an abortive revolt was a Catholic-educated son of a tribal chief. Several priests have been arrested on charges of helping terrorist movements in the south.

The expulsion followed similar ones of the last few years. The Christian missionaries have, in fact, been caught in the political crossfire between the Islamic North and restive South in the Sudan. The fact that most of the rebel leaders are Christians has been the chief basis for the government's expulsion of the missionaries. A returning American Presbyterian missionary has expressed the view that the government simply "did not want us foreigners to see what was going on down there."

The Government has also taken other measures, however, to repress the Christian religion in the Sudan. The Government has placed restrictions on the missions and curtailed the functions of the churches. Christian instruction may no longer include proselytizing. The mission in Malakal is an example. In 1960 the Ministry of Education replaced the Christian headmaster of the mission school with a Moslem. According to an American missionary, the headmaster "changed textbooks, burned Bibles, and gave our Christian boys Moslem names."

In my concern that Christians and Jews are still being persecuted in these areas of the world, I wish to suggest two courses of action:

First, I would suggest the convocation of a "council of the free" among the nations of the world for the express purpose of setting forth the views of the free world concerning religious persecution. It is time for the free world to speak out boldly against religious persecution and to reiterate that faith in human liberties which is the basis of free society.

Secondly, I am introducing before the Congress a concurrent resolution requesting that Congress ask instruction

to the U.S. Delegates to the United Nations to call for sanctions against any country practicing religious persecution. If individual governments violate their charter pledge to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, then the United Nations must act to protect human rights. If I may again quote from the Papal encyclical "Pacem in Terris":

It is our earnest wish that the United Nations Organization—in its structure and in its means—may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and that the day may come when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable, and inalienable right.

As authority for the statements I have made, I cite excerpts from religious and secular publications.

[From the New York Times, June 7, 1964]
SOVIET STEPS UP DRIVE ON RELIGION: NEW RITES SEEK TO SUPPLANT TRADITIONAL OBSERVANCES

Moscow, June 2.—Soviet ideologists are introducing nonreligious spring and harvest festivals and other civil rites in an intensified campaign against the church.

One of the Communist Party's leading propagandists said today in Pravda, the main party paper, that the new system of rituals was being promoted on both ideological and economic grounds.

On the ideological level, he wrote, large sections of the population, including non-believers, are still following the practice of baptism, church weddings, and religious funerals.

From the economic point of view, many religious holidays, such as Easter and Trinity Sunday in the Russian Orthodox Church and Balram festivals in Moslem central Asia, were said to fall in the farm season, distracting peasants from work and causing heavy losses to the national economy.

BEFORE PLANTING, AFTER HARVEST

Instead, the party ideologist, Vladimir I. Stepakov, urged that a new system of Communist festivities be timed before spring planting and after the autumn harvest to prevent the disruption of the agricultural season.

Mr. Stepakov heads the central committee's ideological section for the Russian Republic, which generally sets the tone for reforms in the 14 other Soviet Republics.

Following the Russian example, authorities of cotton-growing Uzbek Republic of central Asia have already decreed the establishment of hammer and sickle festivals before and after the farm season. To promote understanding between town and countryside, spring festivities are to be held in rural areas and autumn festivals in cities.

Mr. Stepakov said that major events in peoples' personal lives should be marked by solemn civil rites designed to wean them away from religious influences.

POLAND ASSAILS CHURCH ANEW

VIENNA, June 4.—Well-informed travelers from Poland report that an intensification of the Polish Communists' campaign against the Roman Catholic Church has been underway since April.

The unpublicized offensive is said to be distinguished by a wide variety of tactics and the fact that it has been broadened to include the harassment of nuns.

It has included arrests, tax prosecutions and land confiscation.

Church-state frictions in Poland were dramatized May 28 when Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski drove about from Warsaw to Wierzbica, near Radom, to conduct mass in

front of a house where Catholics rented a room and turned it into a chapel.

The Wierzbica church had been closed.

The local priest, whose activities led to sealing of the church, has been jailed twice in the last year but was released in time to greet Cardinal Wyszyński, who is Primate of Poland.

The charges on which he had been jailed and the reasons for the closing of the church could not be established.

[From the Brooklyn, N.Y., Tablet, June 11, 1964]

PROTEST FAVORITISM TO VIETNAM BUDDHISTS

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—An estimated 40,000 to 50,000 Catholics staged a 3-hour demonstration here during which speakers—all laymen—protested against what they charged was the favoritism being shown by the government of Premier Nguyen Khanh toward Buddhists.

At the same time, the speakers demanded a "just and more effective national policy" against the Vietcong, or Communist insurgents. Other demands called for a new committee to protect Catholics from persecution and for the freeing of unjustly imprisoned Catholics.

PRIESTS BEATEN IN HUE

According to the speakers, insurgent anti-Catholic sentiment is especially strong in central Vietnam. They charged that priests had been beaten there, churches vandalized, and Catholics spat upon in the streets of Hue, leading Buddhist center.

After a parade through the streets, the demonstrators, for the most part orderly and well-disciplined, assembled in the park in front of the Saigon townhall. Many were said to have come 25 miles on foot from a Catholic resettlement area for refugees from Communist North Vietnam which is regarded as a stronghold of antigovernment sentiment.

The demonstrations took place the day after the revolutionary tribunal here had sentenced to life imprisonment a 37-year-old Catholic officer—Major Dang Sy—whose troops fired on Buddhist demonstrators in Hue last year, killing eight persons and setting off the Buddhist campaign which brought about the overthrow of the former government of Catholic President Ngo Dinh Diem.

DEFENSE WITNESS BARRED

Vietnam's Revolutionary Court refused the request of Dang Sy's attorney to call an American military expert to testify on the effects of the MK-3 grenade. The prosecutor, a Vietnamese lieutenant colonel, protested against granting the request and the nine-man court, which includes four Vietnamese officers, upheld his protest. He gave as his reasons: language difficulty (he himself spoke French fluently on June 5 to me, and some English) and, secondly, national prestige. "We have had our own expert," he said.

The defense attorney held the Vietnamese army expert overstated the effect of this grenade.

The defense maintained that the explosion that caused the eight deaths during the Buddhist disturbance was caused by a plastic bomb thrown by the Communist Vietcong. The Vietnamese officer who made an investigation 3 days after the tragedy testified that the damage done, including a hole in a cement pavement, could not have been caused by an MK-3 grenade.

At the trial, Bul van Luong, who was minister of the interior at the time of the incident, gave a detailed account of his findings when the late President Diem sent him to Hue, May 9, 1963, to investigate. He said he found that General Nghiem, army corps commander, had given permission to Maj. Dang Sy to use armed forces to disperse the crowd if the chief of the province agreed.

The former minister said that the chief of the province, Nguyen van Dang, told him he had instructed Dang Sy to use force in the emergency and not wait for written orders.

A soldier, who testified that Dang Sy's men were given MK-3 grenades but were told by the major to throw them outside the crowd, said he had been forced earlier to make a declaration against Dang Sy. He had been held for months in prison and ill-treated until he consented to sign an accusation.

The prosecutor, in his summary, alleged that Dang Sy ordered his men to throw grenades without the province chief's authorization and that MK-3 grenades caused the deaths. He asserted that Dang Sy's pride was hurt when the crowd threw stones at him.

ATTEMPTED COERCION

During his trial Maj. Dang Sy declared that police tried to make him accuse Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc of Hue of ordering repression of Buddhists. Archbishop Thuc is the brother of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem.

Dang Sy made this statement twice in the courtroom during his vehement 30-minute rebuttal item by item of the prosecutor's lengthy indictment. He said the trial had a religious basis.

He declared he had been held for months in a dark cell where "you could not tell day from night." During that time government agents tried to make him accuse the archbishop, he asserted. Later that day he added that while he was held prisoner in Saigon as well as Hue, he was offered safety if he would put the blame on the archbishop "or on some other priest" for ordering action against the Buddhists.

The government news service did not report the foregoing statement of the major in its account of the trial.

Maj. Dang Sy, aged 35, was trim in a khaki uniform. He wore four campaign ribbons with a palm leaf for the highest army citation and stars for other citations. He attended the advanced officers' training school at Fort Benning, Ga., in 1959. He is married and has seven children, and the birth of his eighth child is expected one of these days.

Dang Sy's mother, aged over 70, came to court to see him.

During an interval in the trial he told me and another correspondent with an ironic smile that he was guilty of two mistakes: "I am a Catholic and I executed my superior's orders."

Some newspapers published violent condemnation of the accused officer as guilty before and during his trial. One English-language daily, the Saigon Post, on its front page the day the trial began, called him in a two-column headline: "Hue Butcher." Three days before the trial the government news service, Vietnam Press, said Dang Sy was "responsible for the massacre of Buddhists." On June 5, the Ministry of Information "asks" the press to report the case objectively.

"If they condemn that man, it will be a travesty of justice," an American sergeant, a non-Catholic, said here.

ARCHBISHOP OF SAIGON: SAYS CATHOLICS UNJUSTLY ACCUSED AND MISTREATED

(Many Catholics in South Vietnam "have been unjustly accused and harshly mistreated" since the fall of the Diem government November 1, 1963. That charge was made by Archbishop Paul Nguyen van Binh of Saigon, speaking for all the Vietnamese bishops, in letters to General Duong Van Minh, chief of state, General Nguyen-Khanh, president of the military Revolutionary Committee and the president of the Council of Ministers. A copy of the letter, dated May 15, has just arrived here.)

While acknowledging the ample good will on the part of the authorities of the country as well as the serious efforts made by the Government particularly by Your Excellency, we have established that the 6 months following the coup d'etat in November of 1963 have ended in an extremely grave situation.

It is with much concern for the fate of their countrymen that the bishops of Vietnam realize it is their duty to call attention of the government to the following points:

No one fails to see that the war has actually grown more intense and that in the countryside the situation has become even gloomier. While the population at large lives in anxiety, among the military, the morale has been damaged and among the officials the will to serve has been reduced because of the uncertainty about the future. All that is not to be ignored by the Government.

Truly it is inevitable that a policy which is passive and lacks the spirit of unity, has led the Government to side with some religious faiths and thus to disseminate disunity and hatred among citizens, instead of bringing the whole population behind the leaders of the country in order to fight the enemy and to rebuild the nation.

As for the Catholics in particular, from November 1, 1963, many of them have been unjustly accused and harshly mistreated. A good number of Catholic officials and military men have become victims of calculated actions totally unjustified. Many have been jailed only because they are Catholic.

If until now we Catholics have silently undergone all such humiliations and injustices, it is because we wish to avoid doing harm to the spirit of national unity—quite indispensable in the war against the Communists. Moreover, we have been well aware that the Government is in a situation which is extremely difficult and delicate, and so with much patience we have waited for the Government to take whatever measures are firm and just.

But to continue such a silence now would amount to gravely failing in our duty to the nation.

Revolution in good sense means to put an end to what is evil in order to reconstruct a better present and a better future. Thus a revolution is not to be based upon prejudices against individuals or communities. On the contrary, it has to establish itself on the principles of justice, of unselfishness, and of firmness.

Thus we question what principles and motives have inspired those arrests and imprisonments. One may question whether those citizens who have been arrested and jailed, have been so treated because they have faithfully served the former regime, or worse yet, because they are Catholic.

If those citizens have been accused because they have served the old regime, who would have the courage to be faithful to the present Government? If they are prosecuted because they are Catholic, then human rights have been trampled knowingly and openly.

CASE OF MAJ. DANG SY

Let us speak about the case of Maj. Dang Sy. Everybody knows that he is judged on political and religious ground and not on juridical ground. The proof of this is that for more than a month there has been a campaign by way of films, radio, and the press, to demand his death, and thus to revive hatred among people and to put pressure upon the revolutionary tribunal.

Before May 8, 1963 (and the Government is well aware of this), Maj. Dang Sy, officer of the National Army of Vietnam, has been three times honored, seven times received citations for having courageously fought the Communists and defended the country.

Since he has faithfully carried out his mission on May 8, Dang Sy has never been reproached by his immediate superiors; namely, General of Division Do-Cao-Tri, commandant of the second military region, and General of Division Le-Van-Nghiem, commandant of the first military region.

After November 1, 1963, Maj. Dang Sy was arrested, yet many witnesses who were not tortured and forced to bring false accusations against him, acknowledged that he never committed any fault in fulfilling the mission of reestablishing order (May 8, 1963).

The fact is: To judge Dang Sy is clearly an injustice. And injustice is an enemy of the revolution. Injustice can only serve and make friends with the Communists. It is unthinkable that the Government, while calling communism unlawful, could allow itself to commit an injustice which can bring benefit only to the Communists. It is also unthinkable that the Government could renounce we Catholics, who are most hostile to communism. We believe that to condemn Dang Sy is indirectly to condemn, en bloc, all the Catholics.

PLEA FOR TRUTH AND JUSTICE

Consequently, we urge you to reconsider the case according to truth and justice. Otherwise we bishops and all the Catholics would feel that we have the duty to defend, no matter at what price, truth and justice.

The bishops of Vietnam have made their position clear to the authorities before November 1, 1963. Today we do the same. If we now raise our voice it is because we intend to save the country and to rebuild it.

Please accept, Mr. Chief of State (Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. President of the military revolution committee) expression of our highest regards.

[From the Register, Apr. 5, 1964]

RED DRIVE THROUGH SCHOOLS WORRIES CHURCH: WANT POLISH YOUTHS TO BE MARXIST MEN

WARSAW.—With religion completely banned from the schools and out of the way, officials of the Communist regime in Poland are going all out in their efforts to rewrite Polish history—Communist style.

The Ministry of Culture has inaugurated a new educational program aimed at forming and educating Polish youngsters in the image of the "Soviet man." The program has created deep concern in Catholic and other Christian bodies throughout the country.

Polish children will become familiarized with such "heroes" of the Russian revolution as Felix Dzierzhynsky at the expense of such traditional national heroes as Jan Henryx Dombrowski (1775-1818), whom the Polish national anthem is named after.

(Dzierzhynsky was a Polish nobleman who became the first head of the Soviet secret police under Lenin. He won "Soviet fame" for his cruel and inhuman treatment of all antirevolutionary elements opposing the Bolsheviks.)

The Ministry's plan calls for rearranging the teaching of Polish history and language and related courses in such a way as to bring about, in the shortest possible time, a "new generation" of Poles "fully aware of the great social and other changes" brought about by the October revolution of 1917.

Under the new program, all students are to be "ideologically educated" regarding the "values" of the Communist system of government and "thus better equipped to live in a new social order."

Polish Catholic leaders were said to be discussing what means they can adopt to prevent children from being, in the words of one commentator, "utterly ruined by this new type of Communist education along Soviet lines."

Polish children in the first grade will begin learning the meaning of the "Red flag" of

"our people's democracy." In the second and third grades, subjects such as the "Life and Work of Lenin," "The Brotherhood of Polish-Russian Arms," and "The Leadership of Gomulka" will be taught. (Wladyslaw Gomulka is First Secretary of the Polish Communist Party.)

In grades 6 and 7, students will be instructed in "the meaning and beneficial" role of the Polish Communist Party and its programs.

Russian will be taught along with the children's mother tongue. It will be a compulsory subject from the fifth grade on to make Polish children fully acquainted with "the life of the Russian people, their patriotism and devotion to communism" and also with "Russia's economic, cultural, and social achievements."

The "Communist Manifesto" of Marx and Engels will be a required subject in the seventh and higher grades.

[From the Register, Apr. 26, 1964]

REDS GRINDING DOWN ORTHODOXY; SHUT 5,000 CHURCHES SINCE 1962

(By Chris Hernon)

No martyrdom of blood, but "legal" pretexts and ruses to foil every effort by believers to practice their religion caused the closing of 5,000 churches since mid-1962—more than half Russia's houses of worship reported open in 1959.

Such is the condition of Orthodox Christians in the Soviet Union, according to Orthodox theology Prof. Olivier Clement writing in the journal "Reforme."

At Kiev, militia units and gangs of juveniles forced their way through the barricaded doors of St. Andrew's Church and dragged the people off, many of them to lunatic asylums. This is a favorite stratagem, the writer observes.

Probably the most serious stage in the stepped-up war on religion, the professor writes, is the dispatch in April 1962, of a secret circular to all bishops, demanding that no child be admitted to receive the Holy Eucharist.

Some churchmen sought to go along with the new rules in order to save existing institutions.

Others, including Metropolitan Nikolay of Gruditsky, protested. Second ranking prelate in Russian Orthodoxy, he had wished to be at the same time a zealous priest and an ardent Soviet patriot. But after his protest he was dismissed and died, December 1961, in a Moscow hospital in a manner not yet clarified. Three other bishops are still in jail.

A German Catholic newsletter on problems of refugees from the East, besides quoting Professor Olivier, cites P. Werenfried von Straaten's view:

"Those who assert that there has been an essential improvement in the situation of the persecuted church are either misinformed or wilfully misinforming." It is not true that Godless communism wants to make its peace with God and give His church freedom, he declares. The writer also refers to the silent bishops of the East, attending the Ecumenical Council with the Government-provided "secretaries" always at their elbows whenever they went out in public. Their silence is a crushing accusation, he says.

"They implored me to continue preaching untiringly on the sufferings of the persecuted church" he wrote, "saying that their despairing flock would never understand if we failed to shout the truth about communism from the housetops."

In New York, at Fordham University chapel, where the sacred Russian icon of Our Lady of Kazan was enshrined pending its transfer to the 1964 New York World's Fair, Catholics, Orthodox and Anglicans

joined in a day-long act of veneration of the Eastern relic.

One of three Eastern Rite Jesuits who celebrated Mass of the Byzantine liturgy in English in the chapel, Father George A. Maloney, S.J., told a press conference earlier that the day of veneration was planned as a symbol of Christian unity and a protest against the stepped-up campaign of religious persecution in the Soviet Union.

Orthodox theologian Father John Meyendorff of St. Vladimir's theologicat, New York, said Soviet persecution of "all religious groups" had been increased steadily since 1959.

[From the Register, May 10, 1964]

SUDANESE GOVERNMENT HAILS CONGOLESE ATTACK ON MISSION

LEOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO.—The Government of the Sudan, which recently expelled all Christian missionaries from its vast southern territory, has hailed as "brothers" Congolese rebels who besieged a Scandinavian Protestant mission in the east-central part of the Congo.

The Sudan Daily, Government-owned newspaper in the Sudanese capital of Khartoum, saluted the assault on the mission in Kivu by declaring:

"Our Congolese brothers * * * showed their discontent with the missions in their efforts to expel missionaries. They have discovered, as we have done before, that those missionaries are not preaching the word of God, but are missionaries of subversion and sedition."

It added: "The Congolese brothers in Kivu have exercised their right to self-rule and freedom in the most courageous and effective manner. They have shown the most forceful form of protest to the subversion of the Scandinavian mission."

[From the Denver (Colo.) Register, May 24, 1964]

HE NOTES PERSECUTION: SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM SORROW TO POPE PAUL

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Pope, in what is believed the first public pronouncement on the subject, has taken note of Soviet persecution of the Jews and made known his concern.

The Pope's reaction came April 14 in a 15-minute audience with Daniel Neal Heller, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, and Abraham Kraditor, past national commander. The Jewish War Veterans revealed the incident in a release from their national headquarters here.

According to Mr. Heller, the Pope made known his disapproval of such discrimination as well as his deep feeling for, and understanding of, the predicament of the Soviet Jews. "He made it known to us," Mr. Heller said, "of his desire to promote through a spiritual call to conscience, the alleviation of their problems. 'These poor, poor people,' exclaimed the Pope, 'we must all pray very, very hard for them. I will personally pray for them.'"

The Jewish War Veterans characterized the historic meeting "as one of the most significant face-to-face meetings" involving the leaders of an American Jewish organization and a pontiff of the Catholic Church.

The new national commander, on taking office in August, had pledged to seek an audience with Pope Paul VI specifically to discuss the plight of Soviet Jews.

In recent months, reports emanating from the Soviet Union and elsewhere have talked about anti-Jewish articles appearing in Soviet journals; of the closing of many synagogues in the Soviet Union; of the failure to consecrate burial grounds and of a general campaign to end Jewish learning by depriving Jews of indispensable tools, such as books and other religious materials.

CRACKING THE WHIP—POLITICAL STYLE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the accounts of President Johnson's press conference yesterday make interesting reading. He obviously is cracking the whip over congressional leaders, particularly with respect to some 30 bills which he considers important. Like Members of Congress, Mr. Johnson realizes the Presidential conventions are imminent, and he feels attention should be given to certain "must" bills prior to adjournment.

Mr. Johnson has requested that Republicans in Congress permit votes on as many of these bills as possible. One of these bills is the so-called Powell-Landrum poverty package, H.R. 11377. This bill, Mr. Johnson declared, was delayed "time and again" in the House Committee on Education and Labor. It was finally reported by that committee, he added, by "strictly a party vote, which we regretted very much."

Mr. Speaker, has the President inquired why this was a party line vote? I wonder why he only now expresses regret that all Democrats supported this poverty package, and all Republicans opposed it? Is he implying that Republicans have delayed action in committee? Does he really feel the Democrats can justify a holier-than-thou approach with respect to this legislation?

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the committee gave far too little consideration to H.R. 11377, not too much. Had they wanted to, the Republicans could not have appreciably delayed the schedule established by the Democratic majority. Indeed, on numerous occasions Republicans were ruthlessly denied an adequate opportunity to question witnesses. Many witnesses were interrupted before they could even answer a specific question, and others who were scheduled were abruptly told they would have no chance to testify.

Does the President know, I wonder, that Democrats argued for 2 weeks in rump sessions over just what changes should be made in the President's recommendations, to make it palatable to them? Does he know, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans protested against this disruption of the normal committee processes, and the delay which these internal disputes made necessary?

Mr. Speaker, has the President been informed as to why this bill was reported on a partisan basis? For instance, does he know that no amendment of any significance offered by any Republican was accepted? Does he know, or care, that none of the constructive suggestions which were made by members of the minority was accepted, even though they were offered in an honest effort to strengthen carelessly written, and poorly conceived, legislation?

We Republicans on the committee have deplored the lack of interest which the Democrats showed toward our reservations, criticism, and suggestions. Hitherto, all members on that committee have often worked as reasonable men and women to develop reasonable compromises, but with respect to this poverty package there has been a continuing and deliberate effort to sabotage such efforts by Republicans.

At his press conference President Johnson also mentioned that several Republicans plan to testify on H.R. 11377 before the House Rules Committee. Very generously he declared that "we want to give them a chance to testify." How thoughtful of the President to allow Republicans this courtesy. But I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether such a comment does not betray impatience with Republicans for necessitating still further delay in getting this bill for a vote? Does the President not realize that Democrats also want to testify? Has he not heard that a single Democratic proponent of the bill took 3 days of the Rules Committee's time in attempting to explain, and defend, its provisions? Has he not been informed that the time that single Democratic witness required was twice as long as he felt that the whole House should be allowed to debate the merits—and the obvious weaknesses—of the bill? Does he realize that Democratic proponents contend that 4 minutes would be enough for each member of the House Committee of Education and Labor to discuss this bill on the floor, with no time at all available for other members who may wish to express their views?

Obviously, the distance between the White House and Capitol Hill remains considerable, even in these days of improved communications. It is somewhat surprising, however, that one with long legislative experience himself should misread so completely what is occurring here on Capitol Hill.

COMMISSAR POSTMASTER

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, welcome a new official figure on the American scene—commissar postmaster.

Today in a statement being personally delivered by Postmaster General Gronouski at a Postmasters' Conference in Baltimore, the postmasters of this Nation are being ordered to become active all-out propagandists for so-called equal employment opportunity.

I include at this point the relevant portion of Postmaster General Gronouski's statement released today by the Post Office Department:

In the area of recruitment the postmaster is expected to take a more active part in community affairs. As the representative, and often the principal spokesman for Government in his locale, we expect him to state

clearly the policy of the Government with regard to equal employment opportunity. He is totally responsible for informing employees well in advance of examinations for establishing new appointment registers. A great part of this task is in contacting minority group organizations so that they can encourage their members to participate.

Postmasters will be expected to attend conferences and make themselves available for speaking engagements at functions relating to equal employment opportunity.

Get active in your community, state the policy of the Government on equal employment opportunity and its relationship to the Post Office Department, and while you are doing that you will be sowing seeds of understanding, which are basic to the solution of our Nation's problem.

The nub of this directive can be summed up in these two statements by the Postmaster General:

First. The postmaster is "often the principal spokesman for Government in his locale." I had naively supposed that that role was held by the representative in Congress.

Second. Postmasters are directed to "get active" in their communities and to "state the policies of the Government on equal employment opportunity."

I had supposed naively that the business of the postmasters was to get the mail delivered. I have assumed naively that postmasters would of course obey, enforce, and implement the law of the land in the performance of their official duties.

I suggest that the Postmaster General's directive will require postmasters to go far beyond this responsibility and to assume the role of public advocates and educators in fields totally unrelated to their official duties.

I am certain that the overwhelming majority of the postmasters of the United States have no desire to become commissars for the Postmaster General.

REPUBLICANS HIDING BEHIND "OR" ON VIETNAM

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, now, right now is the time for each major Republican candidate for President to speak out on what he proposes for Vietnam. Our country has been baraged with statements that we should "get in or get out" of Vietnam. The President's policy of trying to assist the local government to victory, maintaining the war as basically their war, has been derided as a foolish policy. How many times have we read that first this Republican candidate and then that one says, "It is time to get in or get out."

Well, now is the time for these presidential candidates to speak out as they offer themselves for the Republican nomination. Which do they recommend? Do they recommend that we get in or that we get out? The American people are entitled to know. A large segment of the American people, the Republican Party

will choose one of them in the next few weeks as their standard bearer. It is therefore their duty to state their decision instead of taking the cowardly position of hiding behind that little word "or."

If they think we should get in with American troops and make the war our war in every respect, should not they have the courage to do so? If so, how many divisions do they recommend be sent and when? Or, if they feel that we should get out, would not it be better to say so now so the people would know what the choice is between the candidates?

Personally, I have always felt that an effort should be made to eliminate partisanship in international affairs, and I am sorry that the Republican candidates have injected politics into the very serious situation in Vietnam, but they have done so and have actually made it their chief campaign vehicle so far. Since they have done so and since they repeatedly say "get in or get out," the time has now come for them to say which they prefer so the American people will have a clear choice.

It is obvious from things that have been said by leaders in the administration that the policy of the present administration is to win in Vietnam but to attempt first to do it by assisting the local government rather than making the war our war. If that fails every indication is that our country will go in with American troops and make the war our war in every respect. Personally, as a Member of Congress who has been a member of the House Armed Services Committee for many years, I think that for the time being it makes sense to pursue the current policy, but the sole purpose of my speech today is to challenge the candidates for the presidential nomination in the Republican Party and ask them to cease hiding behind that little word "or" and say precisely what they mean.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY—THE KEYSTONE OF FREEDOM

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will welcome to the Capital two youngsters from Syracuse, N.Y., who won first prizes in a teen-theme essay contest which I recently sponsored.

They are Miss Karen E. Corso and Mr. C. Michael Haskins who wrote on the subject of "Individual Responsibility—the Keystone of Freedom."

Sponsoring this contest is one of the outstanding privileges I have had in public life. I have been provided a rare insight into the thinking of our youngsters today, not only through the winning essay but from the more than 500 others submitted.

I am looking forward to showing these two youngsters around their Capitol tomorrow and I hope they will receive as

much inspiration from the tour as I did from their essays.

I am inserting the two essays at this point. They speak eloquently for the writers:

MR. HASKINS' ESSAY

To me, individual responsibility means the duty of each and every one of us to accept our own responsibility for good citizenship and good government. It means that we must keep ourselves well informed on the issues of the day and those of the not too distant past, for often today's issues are only the result of yesterday's unsolved or partly solved problems. This knowledge will help us form valid, intelligent opinions, and a better understanding of the issues involved. We must, if we think it necessary, make our elected representatives aware of our opinions about important legislation. We must never adopt the attitude of "let someone else do it."

We must be very careful not to deny any of our fellow citizens, no matter what their race, creed, or color, the same rights and privileges of citizenship which we expect for ourselves. No injustice, however slight, whether or not we are directly affected, should be beneath our notice.

We should feel free to criticize our Government and our legislative processes but it must be constructive, never criticism for its own sake. We have all heard presumably loyal citizens berating their Government in a way that would bring joy to the Kremlin. Obviously, we should be law-abiding citizens for good laws are the very foundation of our society. If we do not approve of certain laws we should seek to have them changed by legal means, not by defiance.

If we personally do nothing to change things we believe are wrong, if we take no part in electing the people who represent us, if we remain indifferent about our duties as citizens and do not exercise our right to vote, we are disfranchising ourselves and forsaking the greatest opportunities American democracy can offer.

I believe it is the individual responsibility of every one of us to actively participate in local, State, and national affairs for only by doing so are we performing our full duty as American citizens. This does not mean that we should all aspire to political careers by any means; it does mean that we should, for example, attend meetings and lectures which can help us to keep well informed.

I also feel very strongly that it is our individual responsibility to form our own opinions based on clear, informed thinking. We are surrounded by columnists and commentators, many of them well informed though too often biased, who endeavor to mold our opinions. Certainly we should evaluate their views but by all means let our opinions be our own. We must learn to think for ourselves.

Freedom is our birthright but we cannot expect to simply take it for granted without putting forth our best efforts to retain it. Millions have given their lives in the fight for freedom. The least we can do is to dedicate ourselves to preserving what they have won. That, I think, is our greatest individual responsibility. Let's not shirk it.

MISS CORSO'S ESSAY

Individual responsibility is the cornerstone of liberty and the keystone of our Nation's freedom. Responsibility is accepted by an individual in varying degrees—depending on his attitude. Accepting responsibility is the badge of leadership.

Our present society demands education and knowledge that must start early in life. Initiative is rewarded. In school, the pupil learns independent thinking and self-determination. He talks responsibility; he thinks responsibility. He does not really know responsibility—but he feels it.

Responsibility is loyalty to people, church, and State. It is an attitude. It is a respect for your neighbor's rights—and it is self-respect. It is an awe of the power of God. It is studying and putting forth one's best efforts. Responsibility is a willingness to work.

Responsibility is the urge to accomplish and to reach an objective. It is accepting challenge. It defines morality and doing what is right. It is setting example by your deeds. Responsibility whets the imagination.

Responsibility is a fierce defense of liberty and freedom. It is pride in heritage and in our history. Responsibility is simply but eloquently expressed by Lincoln that "this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Preparation for responsibility must be stepped up to strengthen our youth on a person-by-person basis. Instead of a lot of headshaking, our parents and educators need to take stock of themselves. They need responsibility of their own to instill inspiration and responsibility in this Nation's children. Theirs is a profound responsibility.

Let us share a variety of viewpoints and strive with impatience to improve ourselves.

Let us restore God to his rightful place in the constitution of our great Nation.

Let us abolish suspicion, discrimination and intolerance; let us build character in person and in Nation. Let this be our responsibility.

America has been blessed with abundance and generosity to share. In the barren troubled world in which man lives, our country stands out as an oasis—and a symbol.

America was spawned in a desire for freedom and the right of self-government. Americans are born as freemen with a free will. Our leaders are chosen to accept responsibilities and make our Nation's decisions. This defines a free government. Let us always preserve it and may God always bless our land.

The young people of today will be measured as the men of tomorrow. The roots of our Nation run deeply imbedded in liberty and we have defended it with all of our energy. Youth must be responsible for the destiny of our Nation in a complex tomorrow. Our new citizens will go on trial—the eyes of the world will be the jury—and history will record the verdict.

ONLY HALF OF IMPORTED HARVEST CREW AT WORK

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to keep my colleagues and the American consumer, taxpayer, and tax user informed about the problem of obtaining adequate farm labor to harvest crops which supply the food we eat.

To replace the bracero program, farmers, and labor organizations are desperately trying every suggestion proposed.

Someone suggested to the California farmers that they go to the Deep South to recruit farm labor. The Garin Co., a large grower, did just this. After 30 days, the Salinas Californian newspa-

per made the following objective report in the May 29, 1964, issue:

Half of the crew of Mississippi Negroes imported a month ago by the Garin Co. to harvest Salinas Valley lettuce isn't on the job any more.

Of the 46 men recruited by the company in the Mississippi delta towns of Meridian, Natchez, Jackson, and Hazlehurst, just 22 went to work this morning.

There are now not enough Mississippians with the company to form an efficient lettuce harvesting crew. Those remaining were integrated Monday with two bracero crews—of the sort they and other American domestic workers are supposed to replace after December 31, when the Mexican national program expires.

WHAT HAPPENED?

What happened to the members of the experimental crew who gave up the labor of lettuce harvesting?

Garin Co. records show this: One man was sent back, sick, to Mississippi; four reportedly got homesick and returned to Mississippi of their own volition, and four were fired because they didn't work much. No one knows just exactly what's become of the remaining 14, although some of them are said to have found other jobs in the Salinas area that either pay more than \$1.05 an hour, or are easier, or both.

Aggregate man-hours of work available from the Mississippians from April 28 through May 21 was 6,721. Man-hours absent total was 1,097. Nevertheless, John P. McCarthy, of the Garin Co., who helped recruit the experimental crew, says "we haven't given up on it yet."

McCarthy told the Californian that "the fellows remaining on the crew seem to be working very well" and that "competition between them and the braceros" has stepped up their productivity. Besides, the bracero crews are experienced and working on a piece rate, which brings the individual worker substantially more than \$1.05 an hour. (The all-Negro crew "made" the piece rate—and earnings over and above the hourly guarantee—just once on the basis of its production.)

Three of the Mississippians—Roosevelt Howard and William Smith, of Natchez, and James Skinner, of Jackson—haven't missed an hour of work. A fourth man who was in the perfect attendance category, Charlie Smith, of Meridian, quit work this morning.

McCarthy says that "we were under the impression that all of the men were experienced field hands" when they were recruited. This didn't happen to be the case. But most of the 22 men remaining are bona fide agricultural workers.

Since the Mississippians were integrated with the two bracero crews, there have been very few absences from work among them, McCarthy says. He believes that they may have shaken down into a stable work force. But the company—while it is considering worker recruitment from Texas—isn't rushing back to Mississippi for more men. "We'll take a long, close look at the situation before we decide to recruit (there) any more," McCarthy says.

Absenteeism among the Mississippi crew began on May 5 and reached a high point on May 21, when just 11 men reported for work.

NOT CUTTING, PACKING

Garin field foreman Joe Brooks said this morning that the Mississippians are being used as carton spray and pad men, wind rowers and loaders in the fields. The cutting and packing of lettuce is generally being done by braceros, of which the company now has 271 out of a total work force of 325.

The Garin Co. screened some 159 workers in Mississippi before selecting the 46 men it bussed to California at a cost of \$2,874.40. A bonus arrangement between the company

and the new men is that each one of the workers who stays on the job for 3 months will get a free bus trip back home. The company is deducting \$5 a week from the checks of the men to reimburse it for transportation costs. A charge of \$1.75 a day is assessed each man for room and board at the company's McFadden road camp, where the Mississippians are housed with 103 braceros.

McCarthy conceded that the experimental crew members have been averaging less than \$50 a week take-home pay thus far. But with the Valley's heavy lettuce harvesting now getting underway, he says that they'll be earning more than \$50 a week.

Mr. Speaker, the \$50 is a net figure—after deducting \$5 per week for return transportation and \$1.75 per day for board and room.

When the Mississippians first arrived at the labor camp, the Garin Co. was laying out special southern meals for them. Recently, however, the new men started getting the same food as the braceros. McCarthy says that they have balked at substituting tortillas for bread; so they're going to get bread from now on.

FAILURE OF GARIN FARM LABOR RECRUITMENT EXPERIMENT

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I reported for the benefit of my colleagues, who are concerned about the harvesting of fresh fruit and vegetable crops, about the Garin Co. experiment in recruiting farm labor from faraway Mississippi.

A full report of the experiment cannot be given yet. The experiment is not concluded. A few of the workers which were recruited at great cost, careful planning and wide cooperation are still working. Most quit shortly after arrival in California. None could perform the stoop labor well. The company lost heavily. The State of California will be required to increase its welfare payments. Some union men will lose their jobs. The dislocated workers are disillusioned and disappointed. Crops will spoil in the fields.

A spokesman for the Council of California Growers had the following to say to the Salinas Californian newspaper on May 29, 1964:

The questionable success of the Garin Co.'s experiment with imported field labor raises some disturbing questions.

The dwindling of Garin's crew of Mississippians by more than half in just a month at work in the Salinas Valley is symptomatic of "a potentially dangerous situation," Tom Ellick, of the council, said.

MAKES PEOPLE THINK

"This should at least make people think about the problems involved should agriculture find it necessary to go out of the State on a massive recruiting program to pockets of poverty," Ellick said in a telephone interview.

The Council of California Growers is the public relations arm of California agriculture.

Speaking of the Garin crew, Ellick said that "here are underprivileged people who have been thoroughly screened by the prospective employer and by representatives of the Federal Government and the agencies of two States. They signed up voluntarily to do farm labor under specific wages and specific conditions in a specified work agreement. Yet, after they had been in the Salinas Valley a matter of just 2 weeks, they began to follow what is now an almost historic migration from farm work to other types of work."

WELFARE PROBLEMS

Ellick said that the rapid movement of workers from rural work to job seeking in urban areas has historically meant skyrocketing welfare costs. "It seems to us that some real serious thought should be given to what's going to happen if agriculture has to recruit on a large scale out of the State."

Ellick said that the swift movement of the Mississippians out of California's farm labor market raises the question: "How many American workers will it take to replace the jobs now held by some 60,000 braceros at the peak of the harvest season?" He said he believes that it may take "three, four, five times as many people—and they won't go back where they came from, either."

FACTS OF LIFE

"The facts of life," Ellick said, "do not substantiate the contention of the AFL-CIO that California has enough willing, unemployed workers to do the job for agriculture. * * * It's about time the State administration and the department of employment and other powers that be found out what it would take to get the unemployed back on the rolls—and what wages they'd work at. "Agriculture has to know, and it has to know damn soon," he said. "We need some straight answers."

Mr. Speaker, no opponents of the bracero program has had anything to say about this experiment which failed.

GUANTANAMO NAVAL BASE: GUARDIAN OF PANAMA CANAL APPROACHES

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in many statements in the Congress concerning the problems of the Caribbean, especially those by my distinguished and scholarly colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOB], the importance of the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo to the security of the Western Hemisphere has been repeatedly emphasized.

Dramatized by the decision of Red Cuba to stop the fresh water supply to this naval base from its source on the Yateras River outside the limits of the base, Guantanamo has become increasingly recognized for its roles in both war and peace. In war, this strategically located base, on the northern flank of the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal, can control shipping routes; in peace, its commodious protected anchorage in Guantanamo Bay close to deep water and its favorable climate make it

the best fleet training facility south of the Chesapeake area.

It was, therefore, gratifying to read in the May 1964 newsletter of the Chief of Information, Department of the Navy, an authoritative summary of approved naval policies concerning the maintenance and operation of the naval base at Guantanamo.

In order that the Nation and the Congress may be more widely informed, I quote the indicated Navy Informational Policy Summary—NIPS-6—and commend it for study by all concerned with problems of hemispheric defense:

[Chinfo Newsletter, May 1964]

NAVY INFORMATIONAL POLICY—SUMMARIES
GUANTANAMO NAVAL BASE

The U.S. naval base at Guantanamo is very important to the security of the United States and the Western Hemisphere. The continuing policy of the United States is to retain the base indefinitely in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of 1934. The most recent confirmation of this long-standing policy was in a Pentagon news briefing by the Secretary of Defense on March 5, 1964. Prior to that, the Secretary of State had said, "The basic fact is that we are in Guantanamo and will remain there for the foreseeable future." These policy statements followed the Castro regime's decision to shut off Guantanamo's fresh water supply on February 6, 1964, and U.S. Navy's subsequent determination to provide its own source of fresh water, which is now the fact and will remain so.

Background

Guantanamo, the United States oldest overseas naval base, was acquired through a lease agreement with Cuba in 1903. The 1903 agreement was subsequently confirmed by a treaty of relations in 1934. In 1959, the Castro regime stated, "All international commitments and agreements in force will be fulfilled."

Guantanamo is a bulwark in the base complex of the United States. It includes an excellent harbor, docking and ship repair facilities, and two airfields including one field for jet aircraft with necessary shops and hangars. The base includes a total of 1,400 buildings and represents a total investment of approximately \$76 million.

Wartime role

Guantanamo's wartime role is the support of combatant naval forces, operating in the Atlantic, and defending the Caribbean sea areas. Strategically, the base provides a link in the island chain stretching from Key West to Trinidad. From this base, the southern approaches to the United States can be controlled; this includes the Windward Passage on Cuba's eastern tip; the Straits of Florida between Puerto Rico and Cuba; and the Anegada Passage near Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. All these passages are focal points of shipping and can be controlled from Guantanamo. The base is also essential to the defense of the Panama Canal. Its most important wartime role would be its support of antisubmarine forces in the Caribbean and the Atlantic, thereby contributing to the safety of free world shipping. Forces based in Guantanamo can also respond promptly to contingencies and lend assistance when natural disasters occur in the area.

Peacetime role

Guantanamo's peacetime role is its support of essential fleet operational training. The advantages of Guantanamo as a fleet training base are many. The harbor is deep, large, and well protected from the weather. The anchorages are only a few hundred yards from deep and open water, which elim-

inates wasted time steaming to and from the operating areas. The excellent weather permits maximum use of available training time, even during the winter season. Targets for air weapons training are within sight of the airfield, again eliminating time to and from the training area. The aerial gunnery range is the only one available to the Atlantic Fleet which is unhampered by commercial air traffic.

Guantanamo has been used since 1904 to provide "shakedown" and refresher training for Atlantic Fleet air units and ships of all classes. Guantanamo-based fleet training group instructors, who are experts in their specialties, conduct what amounts to an intensive period of on-the-job training whereby the green crews of newly commissioned or overhauled ships are brought up to acceptable fleet standards. Guantanamo makes it possible to expedite training, thus freeing the maximum number of ships and squadrons to meet the U.S. Navy's farflung commitments of the Atlantic Fleet. It is by far the Navy's best facility for refresher and underway training.

No adequate alternatives

Guantanamo offers the best harbor-base complex south of Chesapeake Bay. It could provide anchorage to a major portion of Atlantic Fleet's combatant tonnage. San Juan, P.R., is comparatively small. Roosevelt Roads is protected by a breakwater. Guantanamo remains an important element of hemisphere security.

DALLAS: ITS ASSETS

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there are still those misguided and malicious persons who continue to depreciate the great city of Dallas and its people. There are those who, for political reasons and some for baser reasons continue to spread falsehoods and slander against my community.

Dallas, in the greatness of its heart, can live with the libel. We regret the evil intent behind some of the attacks, but we continue to move ahead in the best American tradition, building our community, making a better place for all our people to live, and contributing what inspiration and effort we can to a stronger, healthier, happier, more prosperous America.

To all our critics, as well as those who are friends of Dallas, we invite you to come to see us, share with us our faith in the American system, join with us in our constant endeavor to preserve this great Nation and the freedom it guarantees to all men.

As a part of these remarks I would like to include a speech about Dallas delivered by Mr. James M. Collins at Southern Methodist University in Dallas on April 28, 1964.

Mr. Collins, I am proud to say, is one of the fine people of Dallas whom I have the honor and the privilege to represent in Congress. He is president of Fidelity Union Life Insurance Co. and an out-

standing civic leader. He is typical of the unselfish, forward-looking kind of individual Dallas produces.

I commend your attention to Mr. Collins' appraisal of Dallas, its aspirations, its goals, its achievements:

DALLAS IS A GOOD BUY IN TODAY'S MARKET
(A speech at Southern Methodist University on April 28, 1964, by James M. Collins, president of Fidelity Union Life Insurance Co.)

As a result of Dallas greatest tragedy, the death of our beloved President Kennedy, our city has been analyzed, criticized, and vilified.

This all began after the greatest welcome that any man had ever received in the history of Dallas. He was assassinated by a stranger of our city, a man living under an assumed name, who had been here only 30 days. He was a Communist-Marxist who had lived in Russia for 3 years. But Oswald chose Dallas as the place for his infamous crime.

Since that dark day, many newspapers and magazines have written about Dallas. To reflect their attitude, let us cite specific examples:

In a recent issue of the NATO Letter, Prof. H. Wentworth Eldredge referred to Dallas and Texas as "a semicivilized part of America . . . with its lunatic fringe of hatemongers."

Look summed up the estimate of Dallas with a quotation from an unnamed cab driver, "Dallas used to be a nice town, but now its got to where everybody's scared of everybody else or hates everybody."

Those of us who have lived in the city all of our lives have been shocked at the charges of hate.

Who is it that we hate? We do not hate the Negroes. The president of the northern Negro Baptists visited Dallas just a few weeks prior to the President's trip. He stated that Dallas had done more than any other large city in the country to help the progress and development of Negroes and that Dallas should be used as a model by other cities.

As for other minority groups, consider our Jewish citizens, who make up only 3 percent of the population. Among this 3 percent are many of our hardest working and most dedicated civic leaders. It is noteworthy that in 4 of the past 9 years Dallas has chosen a Jew as its outstanding citizen—Stanley Marcus (merchant), Fred Florence (banker), Jerome Crossman (oil), and Julius Schepps (wholesale liquor distributor). Many of the most loyal and enthusiastic builders of Dallas are our Jewish friends.

Dallas is located on a flat piece of land. Its dismal picture was summed up by Life magazine: "Dallas had no natural resources and has none today. No precious metals, no sulfur, no natural gas, or oil lie beneath or near the city. The summer's heat is almost beyond enduring. The black-land prairie, once good for growing wheat or cotton, is now exhausted. And this dry land blows up such prodigious duststorms that one might as well comb his hair with a plow."

Dallas is a city with nothing but manpower, and a philosophy of self-reliance. Life quoted an editorial from the Dallas News which was said to reflect the Dallas point of view: "When our forefathers stepped on the west bank of the Mississippi and headed west to carve an empire, did they look back over their shoulders to the National Government for welfare and help? No, with an ax and a Bible and a wife, the pioneer did it himself."

Dallas started as a log cabin near a small river, about 100 years ago. There was a need to ford the river and this was a good spot. As the community grew the settlers saw that they needed more than a river ford, so they made arrangements for the East-West railroad to build its tracks through the vil-

lage. With one railroad the citizens went to work and secured a crossing North-South railroad and Dallas became a crossroads town.

The railroads needed freight, and since buffalo skins were a big freight item, the people went to work and made Dallas the destination of buffalo traders from the West. Dallas actually became the buffalo hide center of the world.

When the buffaloes were killed off and cattle took their place on the prairie, the city changed quickly to cutting leather—the making of saddles, bridles, and harnesses—and the new local industry became a tremendous factor in the national market for horse-and-buggy goods.

When Henry Ford and mechanized farm equipment swept the country, Dallas went through another transition; finance and cotton trading. Cotton was brought and sold for the world market, and the city became the cotton-trading center of the world. In 1932, Washington established fixed minimum prices on cotton which eliminated a large amount of the trading.

Again Dallas moved with the changing times and actively entered the oil business by inducing oil producers in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and east Texas to come to Dallas to make their deals, arrange their financing and centralize their offices here.

In recent years world oil production has necessitated changes within the industry and Dallas has expanded to other industries and moved further into electronics, finance and insurance.

Dallas has been criticized for its so-called oligarchy but this is Dallas' greatest strength—instead of one leader, we have hundreds. Leadership and management is any organization's greatest asset. As one business leader said: "There is no good business, just good management."

The other day I heard a stockbroker evaluate stocks. He analyzed the location of the plants, growth tendencies in the industry, price earnings ratio. But, he said the important factor about a company is that it has good management, that it has good leadership. This is true of a church, or a school, or of a business. Good leadership is your greatest asset.

With our abundance of dynamic leaders, Dallas has one of the most diversified economies in the United States. We have the finest market merchandising facilities in the Nation. Dallas is much in demand as a convention center. Dallas is third in the Nation in number and importance of its fire and life insurance companies.

The city's varied interests are reflected in a rough breakdown of the payroll:

Dallas payroll	Percent
Manufacturing.....	25
Wholesale.....	13
Retail.....	13
Services.....	12
Education and government.....	10
Finances and insurance.....	8
Construction.....	7
Transportation (64 carriers).....	6
Communications and utilities.....	3
Oil and gas.....	3

Let us look at the personality of Dallas. It is a friendly city that offers much and receives even more from its citizens.

1. Friendliness is Dallas' natural manner. My friend Chuck Conklin, of Alcoa, said that when he moved to Dallas the thing that impressed him was the interest of his neighbors and the welcome he received in becoming a part of the city.

We do not have as many millionaires as New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Houston; but the difference is that in Dallas we call them by their first names.

2. Sound value is basic in Dallas. The cost of living is less in Dallas than any major metropolitan city in the country according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures, and

"FHA homes—1960," shows that when you buy a home you get a better value per dollar in Dallas than anywhere in the United States.

3. Spiritually either "spirit of pride" or "religious spirit"—Dallas has it. It is the home of the four largest churches in the world of their denomination: Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Church of Christ. From pride, we are proud of our heritage and the future we are trying to make for our children.

4. Beauty stems from pride. Even on a quick visit to Dallas the visitor is pleased with the beauty of the new skyscrapers, the homes, the elegance of private gardens and above all, the beauty and charm of our ladies. Dallas women are frequently referred to as the best dressed women in the world.

5. Broadmindedness is a firm attribute of the city. Dallas has been described many times as a town of nondrinking, abstaining people. But last year we chose for our outstanding citizen Julius Schepps, who is a liquor distributor.

6. Solid middle class gives stability to Dallas. We have a prosperous middle class; people enjoy living in our community. Census figures show Dallas has more homes with air conditioners and television sets per capita than elsewhere in the United States. But probably the best yardstick of prosperity is the two-car family. Dallas has more two-car families per capita than anywhere in the world. We have three times as many as San Francisco and four times as many as Boston.

7. Education means progress for Dallas. It has been said that businessmen set the pattern for Dallas. If this is correct, then education has top priority in our community: one-third of the directors in the chamber of commerce are assigned to the seven active committees concerned with education.

Last week we were all proud to note that, among the top students in high schools, Dallas stood 5th in the Nation in merit scholars, whereas we are only 13th in population. Three years ago the leading scholars at both West Point and Annapolis were graduates of a Dallas high school.

In Dallas, over half of the teachers have master's degrees. Under our accelerated educational program, Dallas now has over 1,000 students in advanced courses.

Our schools excel and have kept up with the growth of Dallas. We have built more schools and more classrooms than any city in the country—103 new buildings and 68 refurbished. We have also been adding neighborhood libraries and physical education facilities for a broader educational program.

8. Cooperation is the key in Dallas, where everyone works together. Many cities are reluctant to submit a bond issue and do it only every 10 years, hoping that they can squeeze by. In Dallas, city improvements are moving rapidly all of the time; and since World War II we have had a bond issue every 2 or 3 years. Just last month a bond issue on civic improvements came and we favored it 5 to 1.

9. Good local government reflects the integrity of the Dallas people. I recall so well a statement made by a vice president of General Electric who said, "The true reflection of a community is to see the character of elected public officials." For the last 30 years we have looked to honest and capable business leaders from throughout the city to enter city politics and serve on the Dallas City Council. Partisan party politics is put aside where the city is involved. Of the last four mayors, two have been presidents of large downtown banks, one a past president of the Texas Manufacturers Association and the present mayor is chairman of the board of Dallas' largest industry.

In Dallas, where we have built so many schools, so many expressways, and since the war have put \$514 million into public im-

provements for the expanding city, we have the least taxes per capita of any city in the country. We have no city income tax, no sales tax, and an ad valorem tax that is fairly evaluated. Here are some typical figures: Dallas, \$875; Boston, \$1,139; New York, \$1,092; and Cleveland, \$1,175.

10. Opportunities present a thrill to every citizen of Dallas. As I ride up and down the streets of Dallas, I see place after place where people started from scratch and developed a tremendous operation. One typical example is the Haggard Co. Here was a fine man of strong character. He first came to Dallas as a pants salesman—an immigrant from Lebanon. He sold and he saved and then started manufacturing for himself. Now J. M. Haggard is the largest slacks manufacturer in the world.

11. Brains provide Dallas with a stimulating environment. The largest business in Dallas is a reflection of the type of city that we have. Texas Instruments is a business that is built on brains—new ideas and vision. Texas Instruments cannot stand still. When they build a new piece of machinery, they anticipate that it will be obsolete in 9 months. New ideas and new machinery are continually moving this industry forward.

This is Dallas where our greatest asset is the people—people full of love who believe in God and themselves. People who are not afraid of hard work, who are self-reliant, and who cherish freedom for themselves and for their children.

THE RINGING OF BELLS: A FAVORED WAY OF OBSERVING THE FOURTH OF JULY

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on June 26 a year ago, the House gave final approval to a concurrent resolution prescribing the ringing of bells throughout the country at 2 p.m., eastern daylight time, as an appropriate way of observing the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence on the Fourth of July.

With this great national holiday rapidly approaching, it seems fitting to recall our action of a year ago and to encourage public officials and the American people to continue and broaden the deeply meaningful practice of ringing the bells as a means of commemorating the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

As the sponsor of a similar resolution, I regretted that only a few days remained last year between congressional approval of the resolution and the Fourth of July, which limited the extent to which a coordinated program for ringing the bells could be arranged. We can do much better this year if officials at all levels of government will increase their efforts to make the observance truly national.

When it was signed and proclaimed to the world of 1776, the Declaration of Independence was a revolutionary document in every sense of the word. It marked the birth of a new nation as a

free and independent state. As such, it ended 150 years of colonial status and alien rule by the most powerful empire of the time.

It was a bold and courageous act by people who understood fully the implications of what they were doing. The freedom and independence to which they pledged themselves was a condition of life they believed was the rightful heritage of all people, and for which they were prepared to sacrifice the ultimate—their own lives and fortunes. Their declaration was not an empty or reckless gesture, as the years of bloody warfare which followed confirmed.

They were right; they were determined; and they were successful.

But in celebrating their courage and vision—to which we have become the fortunate heirs—it is not enough simply to look to the past in the sense of completed history. The Declaration of Independence has always been a uniquely living document, phrased in language that seems permanently contemporary, and possessed of the power to inspire people everywhere to the pursuit of personal liberty and national independence.

We here—in this time and place—can do no less. Indeed, it is our task to help make of the Declaration the truly revolutionary statement it has always been, to help make its enduring principles come fully alive again in our own day. It has never been more important than it is today for all Americans to understand what freedom means, to appreciate the blessings that freedom has brought us, to face together the dangers which freedom confronts, and to accept the obligations which freedom imposes upon all of us.

The framers of the Declaration of Independence understood that freedom is not a tangible commodity which—once possessed—remains secure. They knew not only that freedom can be lost but that, like a living organism, unless freedom continues to grow and expand it is in danger of death.

It belongs to every person and to each generation to keep freedom alive and growing—in the human spirit, in our institutions, and in the law of the land. Even in our own country—proud as we rightfully are of the extent to which freedom has thrived among us—freedom is still our unfinished business. We have only to glance about us to see how far we, the oldest continuing democracy on earth, have fallen short of realizing the full promise of freedom for all our people. And beyond our borders, the situation is even more challenging.

It would be foolish to imply that the ringing of bells might somehow galvanize us all into doing what needs to be done to extend the scope and perfect the quality of our freedom. But if it accomplishes nothing more than to bring to our minds—if only for a moment—the significance of our commitment to freedom and to provide a gentle reminder of how our country was born and what it represents, then it will be greatly worthwhile.

Traditionally, the ringing of bells has signified several different things—both of a civic and a religious nature—all of

them compatible with our particular purpose. The sound of bells has summoned the faithful to worship, called the citizens of a community to a town meeting, hailed a great victory, alerted the people to danger, announced the passage of time, and indicated a moment for silent prayer or reflection.

Bells have rung out joyfully and tolled mournfully, but it is as a summons and an alert that I think of the ringing of bells on the Fourth of July—a summons to our responsibilities as free citizens, an alert to the dangers and opportunities that lie ahead of us as we move along the open highways and twisting trails of the free way of life.

No one can predict with any assurance what consequences might flow as a result of a simultaneous, nationwide ringing of the bells on the Fourth of July. As the practice grows and deepens into the national consciousness, however, perhaps we can hope it might lead to a national act of reflection upon and rededication to the ideals of freedom—and give life to the spirit of the day throughout the year.

SOVIET RULE IN ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, when the army of the Soviet Union invaded the peaceful Baltic States in June 1940, it brought with it the most deplorable practices ever enforced by one people on another. Among many other things, the Communists began deporting from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania anyone who might be a leader of opposition to Communist rule. Later they extended deportations to practically anyone who resided there. This was a very large number of people because the Baltic States had never evidenced the slightest conviction in the teachings of Marx and Lenin.

These deportations continued throughout 1940 and 1941. The first few months 100,000 people were either executed or sent to remote parts of Asiatic Russia. As if this were not horrible enough, when the Nazi Army invaded the Baltic, the Soviet conquerors redoubled their efforts. They had long since run out of reasonably important victims and they increasingly persecuted completely humble and innocent people, who had spent their days tilling their soil, or shaping their products, bothering no one, threatening no one. By June 1941, the true intent of the Soviet invasion and deportations became clear—it was to completely eliminate three entire nations and seize the wealth of three peoples for the benefit of the Soviet Union.

With an eye toward the future when the invading Germans might be thrown back, the Russians planned a special effort for June 14, 15, and 16, 1941. They

intended to break forever the will and ability of the Baltic States to resist communism. Therefore, during the night of June 13-14, they began surrounding whole villages and large areas of cities and seizing everyone they found sleeping in the houses. Their operation was diabolically thorough. Men, women, and children were rushed out to waiting trains without time to gather more than a very few personal belongings. Families were separated and sent to different destinations.

The fate of many of the nearly 100,000 Baltic people seized during the horrible days of June 1941 by the Communists is unknown. Some of them perished in railroad cars. Some were worked to death in Siberia. Others have been scattered all over the Soviet Union and forced to adopt the ways of their Russian conquerors. But the fate of the wealth of their many years of hard work is well known. It was given to Russian citizens, who now live in extraordinary numbers throughout the Baltic States. There is no doubt that the Communists hope by this means eventually to destroy completely the independent identity and culture of the Baltic nations.

We make special mention today of the Baltic deportations of June 1941 to urge the Soviet Union to do everything in its power to make restitution to innocent people, and at the same time to remind the world of the consequences of communism.

With confidence that the future holds increased happiness and peace for the long-suffering people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, we send to them our encouragement and words of praise today for their bravery in the face of intolerable agony, and for their continued struggle for independence.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles on "Government Spending," written by Maurice Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

GOVERNMENT SPENDING—I

(A clear and penetrating analysis of Government spending and the national budget, from the broad business viewpoint, is presented by a former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, from a speech to the National Industrial Conference Board.)

(By Maurice Stans)

A year ago, in 1963, the American public was in an aroused hue and cry for large cuts in the Federal budget. Hundreds of thousands of letters descended on Washington. Congress set to work to curb what it considered to be an extravagant program of spending, and by the time it finished its work the requested appropriations for fiscal 1964 had been reduced from \$107.9 billion to less than \$100 billion.

This year, in 1964, the American public gives the impression that it couldn't care less about what happens to the budget. No mail on the subject reaches Congress. The best efforts of a few informed and determined budget cutters in that body will barely add up to sustainable reductions of \$2 billion, if that, in the appropriations for fiscal 1965.

What has happened in 1 year to change the attitude of the Nation so measurably? More importantly, what does the change signify, and what does it portend for the years ahead? Is Federal spending no longer a matter about which we should be concerned? Where are we now and where are we headed?

These are the questions to which I address myself today. I propose to analyze the Federal budgetary situation in the light of the enactment of tax reduction, the change in the Presidency, the 1965 budget and its implications, and the probabilities ahead. I hope that what I have to say will offer a reading on the Government's fiscal prospects that will induce businessmen and the public to come to grips again with the spending issue.

If we are tempted to find simple answers to the questions I have posed, we can start with the two that on the surface seem most probable:

1. The American public, now that it has its tax cut, is just plain disinterested for a time in whether the Government runs a surplus or a deficit.

2. President Johnson has submitted a 1965 budget that he describes as austere, prudent, and frugal, as calling for a reduction in expenditures and in the deficit, and as carrying us a giant step toward a balanced budget.

Putting both of these answers together, we are led to the natural conclusion that the public is thoroughly happy with the idea of an economy-minded President taking over all concern about budgetary policy and undertaking the job of making ends meet in the Government.

But there are pitfalls in this course and here are some of them:

1. A President of the United States, however firm his intentions may be, cannot single-handedly control the public purse. He needs all-out help in any campaign of fiscal discipline for the Nation. The demands of the bureaucrats and the special interests always exceed the country's resources, and their pressures for spending are relentless.

2. Attaining an eventual balance of revenues and expenditures is in fact much more difficult than is implied by the outward appearances of the 1965 budget now before the Congress. This is true because of the composition of the present budget items, because of the inbuilt future growth in certain Federal programs, because of the fact that the full impact of recent and present new proposals is not yet evident, and because of the strength of the forces for spending in the Nation, now highly stimulated by the immense growth of Federal programs in recent years.

In other words, the problems of high and increasing spending and dangerous budget deficits are as much with us this year as last, and will be as much with us in the future, regardless of who is President. National fiscal policy happens to be one of the most highly debatable and fluctuating elements in the functioning of a democracy. It will continue to be so as long as the people consider their National Government to be an impersonal entity able to create unlimited funds to satisfy their desires, not recognizing that only they themselves can provide the wealth that the Government dispenses.

It is well that we recognize that there is no easy solution to budgetary problems, no convenient end to fiscal difficulties, and that those who are sophisticated enough to understand this subject must keep informed,

alert and active. It is timely, in other words, that we reconsider here the inconstant attitude of business toward Government spending.

Frugality, austerity, and economy are terms of comparison, so to evaluate where the 1965 budget stands in this respect we ought to see how it relates to earlier points in time. In other words, to put everything in perspective, we need to look back a bit—to 1960, let us say. You may remember 1960 for a long while. It was the last time the budget of the United States ended in balance. Expenditures of the Government in that year were \$76.5 billion. Now, just a few years later, we are right at the \$100 billion mark.

Shortly before January 20, 1961, the last day of the Eisenhower administration, I submitted to the President the first long-range projections of Federal spending ever compiled. These make a good base for another comparison with the present budget. They were compiled on three levels, for the 10 years from 1960 to 1970. The first was an economy minded and frugal, but wholly possible, level of Federal spending, somewhat more restrained in its trend of growth than in the previous decade. The second was a high, obviously lavish level, which undertook to meet widespread public demands for more spending. The third was a medium level, which was considered to be reasonably progressive and most likely under local and international conditions like those of 1960.

Without going into the arithmetic in detail, I will merely report that the economical level for 1970 (\$83.9 billion) was passed in 1962, the medium level for 1970 (\$97.4 billion) was exceeded by 1964, and the high level for 1970 (\$122.6 billion) is right on the present trend line. In other words, in the 4 years since 1960, spending has been growing at the highest rate objectively conceivable at that time.

To measure our current position and the forces behind it, as the President must deal with them, we could well go over an earlier course of history, reviewing the progression of how we got where we are. In 1930 the entire cost of Government, including interest on the debt, public welfare, and national security, was only \$3 billion. By 1940 it was \$9 billion. By 1950 it had grown to \$43 billion. By 1960 it was \$94 billion. It is now right on target for \$150 to \$160 billion by 1970.

What can the President do to slow down this forceful progression, which has moved at a rate which exceeds the growth in population, the gains in gross national product, or any other valid scale?

Before we find fault with the 1965 budget, there are some things we should say in its behalf. Without doubt it is considerably lower than the total of the desires of the Government agencies, and almost certainly it is somewhat lower than the one which President Kennedy had planned to submit for 1965. But how does it appear in other respects? Here are some simplified statistics:

1. The 1965 budget calls for \$22.9 billion more in program authorizations than President Eisenhower suggested in his last budget for 1962, just 3 years earlier.

2. The 1965 budget asks for \$103.8 billion in authority to spend, which is \$5.5 billion more than Congress was willing to vote last year for 1964. (Even after supplemental appropriations likely to be passed this year for 1964, it is \$4 billion higher.)

3. The budgeted expenditures for 1965 are \$97.9 billion, but this is after deducting \$2.3 billion in sales of Government-owned loans and mortgages and over \$80 million of book-keeping transfers or credits, including some from improbable new legislation. Actual planned spending for the year, before such deductions, is about \$2 billion higher than the truly comparable figure for 1964.

4. It contains some obviously understated appropriations requirements. For example, while the price support program may last out the year on the appropriations requested, because of past authorizations, the normal annual cost of present farm programs is at least \$1.5 billion above the amount of appropriations asked for in 1964.

5. There are some apparent underestimates in expenditures, especially in farm programs. Considering also the fact that the estimates of revenues are on the optimistic side, it is likely that the planned reduction in the deficit, from \$10 billion to \$5 billion, may well fall of accomplishment by a considerable margin.

6. The budget shows a wholly desirable reduction of 1,200 (later increased to 1,900) in Government civilian employment in 1965, but this is after an indicated increase of 22,000 in fiscal 1964 (later decreased to 15,000), and an increase of 156,000 since 1960.

7. It is said to contain vigorous pruning of old programs, when in fact three appropriations are increased (by \$1 million or more) for every one so decreased.

8. The budget contains almost \$6 billion of built-in expansion, including about \$3 billion in proposed enlargements in scope of old programs or to initiate wholly new programs that are sure to grow in coming years. Of all these figures, the requested authority to spend is most significant as a portent of the future. The budgeted appropriations of \$104.3 billion, if increased to reflect annual program requirements of farm price supports, rural electrification, urban renewal, and other items not included this year at normal levels, becomes approximately \$107 billion. This is the base for future appropriations and expenditures and makes doubtful any expectation of subsequent budgets much below this amount. Add to this a carryover of \$95 billion in unspent but largely committed appropriations of earlier years and you can see, for example, how difficult it will be to hold actual spending below \$100 billion hereafter.

This conclusion is compounded by the large amount this year dedicated to beginning new programs. These factors measure the real significance of the 1965 budget, looking ahead, and point up the magnitude of the President's task in holding future budgets at anywhere near the present level.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING—II

(By Maurice Stans)

Only because the national compulsion toward higher spending is so strong can the 1965 budget be termed austere or frugal or economical, as it clearly is in relation to more pleasing alternatives. It is from these positions that the President must take off, and with these figures that he must contend, if the country is to achieve a balanced budget at any time in the next decade.

Assuming that Congress approves the 1965 budget in substantially its present terms, and enacts a large part of the new programs, where do we go from here?

It is wholly unrealistic to believe that the level of Federal spending will ever be significantly reduced. Even an ultimate disarmament is likely to be so gradual that its savings will probably be eaten up by new Government activities and the growing costs of carrying on present ones. The first budgetary fact of life that a President learns is that going programs (like veterans benefits, public assistance, retirement pay, and many others), without any increases in their scope, have a normal built-in growth of close to \$3 billion a year. Therefore, to hold total spending at a fixed point from one year to the next would require reductions of \$3 billion elsewhere and an almost total refusal to entertain new programs or to expand old ones. Yet when revenues are somewhere between \$5 and \$10 billion

behind expenditures, the only way equilibrium can be attained in a reasonable time is for expenditures to be kept from growing very significantly. (A 4-percent annual increase in gross national product would normally produce roughly a \$4 billion increase in Government revenues, but this amount of gain is probably not attainable for fiscal 1966 because of the offsetting effect of the second step of tax reduction. There is talk of more tax cuts in a year or so.

The most desirable course, considering all this, would for the President to propose, and the public to insist, that Government spending be held below \$100 billion until revenues catch up. It is possible that this could produce a balanced budget for 1967. This is a very difficult goal, considering where we are now. It can be attained, but only if a number of factors work out favorably.

1. The economy must carry on at a 4- to 5-percent annual growth rate. Any recession could defer a balanced budget for many more years.

2. Reductions in some Government programs must be imposed. There are good sizable candidates in the farm program (where reductions are politically almost impossible); in the expensive space program (where expenditures can be stretched out and made more effective if the ill-advised goal of a "man on the Moon by 1970" is extended); in the production of atomic weapons (attainable if military target and warhead requirements are suitably re-evaluated); and in defense costs, especially manpower and maintenance of conventional forces (of which President Eisenhower has been an outspoken critic) and overseas defense commitments, including the large number of troops in Europe (which President Eisenhower has many times questioned). By these steps a good start could be made toward the 25-percent reduction in defense expenditures which former Defense Undersecretary Roswell Gilpatrick says may be achieved over a period of time, and American industry would not suffer because most of the reductions would be in operating and overhead costs, and the rest would be very gradual. There are many other opportunities for lesser reductions throughout the budget, of which rural electrification and agricultural conservation are good examples.

3. The President must find a way to stop the normal upward bureaucratic "creep" in other agency activities. There are many programs not related to population growth, to timetables, or to any specific measure of need, that year after year move slowly upward in response to self-generated opportunities in the Government offices. These programs could be stabilized by the President and the Congress until the budget is in balance, at which time new evaluations could be made and new priorities fixed. Among the programs which could, without harm to welfare or national security, be frozen at present levels are soil conservation, construction of public buildings, geological survey, watershed protection, coast and geodetic survey, Corps of Engineers construction, sport fisheries, Bureau of Reclamation construction, foreign agricultural service, and medical research. These are merely illustrations. There are many others.

4. And again, new programs must be withheld until the budget is able to absorb them without strain; and necessary additions to old programs must be financed by reprogramming down some of their present scope.

In other words, the problems of the President in achieving a fiscal balance are imposing and monumental in the light of recent trends and countervailing present forces. Only the utmost determination in Washington and support at home can retard the trend of credit-card spending of the last 30 years.

There are some things that businessmen ought to be willing to do to help achieve the objective of restraint in Government finances. I pose them to you in the conviction that, without strong and emphatic demand from the general public for sound budgetary procedures and practices, the Nation will go merrily along on its deficit-ridden way until it finds itself in a predicament of debt and inflexibility which will sap the national vitality and leave us too weakened to deal with internal and external emergencies.

Here are things each of us can do:

1. Study and understand the annual budgets in more detail, so we are not unduly influenced by published totals which, unfortunately, do not reveal much of the meaningful facts about Government finances. Only by comparison of individual appropriations and categories are the trends clearly evident.

2. Support measures for economy wherever indicated, even though they may mean some temporary disadvantage for our community or our industry. The President and the Congress need to know, year in and year out, that we want sound fiscal policy.

3. Oppose the proliferation and growth of Federal programs not justified by a strict test of necessity for the Nation's security or welfare. Desirability is not adequate justification for Government spending.

4. Support proposals which would give taxpayers a greater direct voice on Federal spending. One such proposal now in Congress is for a Presidential advisory commission on Federal expenditures (which, however, in its present form calls for too many members from the ranks of Government).

5. Urge and support proposals to improve congressional review of fiscal matters. One of these especially worthy would provide a joint congressional committee on the budget, with staffing for majority and minority parties, to provide research on budgetary policy and trends, preliminary to annual appropriation actions. Such a committee could insist on more long-range studies like that which we released in 1961, and more consideration to the long-range consequences of budgetary actions.

You will note, I am sure, that nowhere in this analysis do I say a word about foreign aid. There is no need for me to belittle it; it has few friends. The honest danger is, believe it or not, that under present conditions and attitudes, it may be cut too low for the Nation's good. If you wonder why I make a point of saying this, I hope you will conclude that at least it establishes this whole analysis as being unbiased and objective.

GEN. PAUL D. HARKINS DECORATED

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, at 11:30 a.m. this morning President Johnson decorated Gen. Paul D. Harkins with the second Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal, which is the Nation's highest award for meritorious service and which is awarded only to those soldiers who serve in a position of great responsibility. The country is indeed fortunate to have had General Harkins on active duty in the Regular U.S. Army for the past 35 years. General Harkins was born

in Massachusetts. His distinguished career includes service as deputy chief of staff of Task Force NATO in 1942 and 1943; deputy chief of staff, 7th U.S. Army in 1943 and 1944; deputy chief of staff to General Patton's 3d Army throughout the campaigns across France and Germany. He was the inspirational commandant of the cadet corps at West Point from 1948 to 1951, and then commanded the 24th and 24th Infantry Divisions in Korea and also served as chief of staff of the 8th U.S. Army in Korea. In 1960 he was deputy commander and chief of staff for Headquarters, USAR Pacific, until his assignment in 1962 as commander of the U.S. Military Assistance Command in Vietnam and Thailand.

I had the privilege of serving with General Harkins for 4 years and there is no man whom I respect more, as a soldier and as a man. I would like to include the remarks of President Johnson as he presented the Distinguished Service Medal to General Harkins, and I would also like to include herein the response by General Harkins:

The PRESIDENT. General Harkins, Mrs. Harkins, Secretaries Rusk and McNamara, ladies and gentlemen, and distinguished guests, few duties of the Presidency are so gratifying as an occasion such as this when we come here to say on behalf of a grateful Nation, "Well done" to a good and faithful servant.

Since this Republic was born 188 years ago, our success has come in very large measure from the willingness of individual Americans to serve the cause of us all wherever duty might call, whatever sacrifice duty might demand. General Harkins has at every post and in every way personified this tradition. He has exemplified this great ideal. He has served his country faithfully and well in a long and distinguished career. As staff officer, as senior commander in Europe, in the Far East, he has always been outstanding.

It is a measure of the man and testimony to his valor that General Harkins has received the Distinguished Service Medal twice previously for his achievements during World War II and in Korea.

If medals could be awarded to the wives of officers and men in our services, certainly Mrs. Harkins could deserve high honors today herself. For the past 82 months, while the general has held three extremely sensitive commands in Europe and the Pacific and Vietnam, Mrs. Harkins, as she is today, has been continuously at her husband's side.

Here at the White House earlier this week it was my privilege to present the Distinguished Service Citation to four outstanding civilian career servants who are in the Federal service. I emphasized then that many of our old stereotypes about public employees are obsolete. I said that we must have and we are receiving a new quality of excellence from those who serve the people in civil service positions today.

I think much the same thing may be said, and should be said, about the career, professional military man who serves the cause of freedom in the uniform of the United States today. The old stereotypes do not fit the new generation of American military men. Our democratic society has produced a new breed of commanders. They are men who are devoted to that society's values as well as to that society's survival. Their concern for our preparedness does not eclipse their concern for the world's peace. We and the free world owe to them a debt of deep re-

spect, not only for their professional service, but for their service as citizens of a free civilian society as well.

General Harkins will retire from the service on the 1st of August. I have asked Secretary McNamara, who has such great and unlimited confidence in this great soldier, to have the general remain in the Washington area so that we may benefit from his broad knowledge of and his experience in the various theaters of the world, and particularly southeast Asia.

So, General Harkins, on behalf of the Nation, I am very proud and quite privileged to present to you today the Second Oak Leaf Cluster for your Distinguished Service Medal. I congratulate you. I thank you. I wish you and Mrs. Harkins well for your long and faithful service to freedom around the world. You have earned the best that can come to anyone.

(The citation was read by Secretary McNamara.)

The President. General Harkins' friends are here and I know he will want to visit with them and say hello to them. If you care to, you may proceed.

General HARKINS. Mr. President, Secretary McNamara, Secretary Rusk, distinguished guests, I am greatly honored and deeply moved for this ceremony this morning, and I deeply appreciate also your coming over here to be a member of this occasion. I know how busy you all are, but I certainly appreciate it.

I accept this honor with deep humility, and I will wear the Distinguished Service Medal not for what I have done in Vietnam, but for what the many thousands of Americans, wonderful people, have done there up to today. They have made a tremendous contribution to the effort in southeast Asia. And particularly for those who have given the supreme sacrifice I will wear this.

There is another group that I would like to wear it for, and they are as deserving as myself; it is what I call my "first team," my chief of staff, Dick Weede, is a marine; General Timmes, my Army commander; Rolan Anthus, my Air Force commander; and Captain Drachnik, of the Navy, my Navy commander. They are all here today, and to the "first team" I appreciate all of the work and the very fine work you did.

Mr. President, I want to thank you, the Members of both Houses of Congress, the members of the services, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and last, but not least, Mr. McNamara and the Department of Defense, for all of the support that I have had while I have been in Vietnam.

I don't think any commander any place, at any time, ever got as full support as I have, and it has made my job so easy out in Vietnam. As you know, I have always been an optimist. I guess I was born one, and I continue to be an optimist about Vietnam. There will be times when things look dull, but that is not for the weak. When I left Vietnam, I was very encouraged from the reports I received, and from going around the country and the reports I received from the various advisers throughout the land, very, very encouraged.

As you know, running a complicated war such as is going on in Vietnam now, with a good, strong government, is very, very difficult to do. Without an effective government, it is almost impossible. Up to just recently we haven't had an effective government for, say, the last 9 months. So when you are not in command, and you are trying to go to see somebody to tell them what to do or give them some advice, you can't find them and if you do find somebody, they are not the right people. It is very, very difficult. I think now that General Khanh and his government, which has been in power for 4 months, is beginning to take hold, the programs that we have helped them devise are beginning to show little lights here

and there. I won't say everything is fine. It isn't. But at least we have a good base, the Government is on the initiative, and I think they have the determination and the will, and all we need is time and patience.

I am reminded of our own revolution. It took 8 years to get through our revolution, and then we ran into some of the toughest guerrillas that we ever want to run into any place—the American Indians. We started what we call in Vietnam today an oil spot moving across the country. The last Indian war was 1892, over 100 years after we started our Revolution. There is a social revolution going on now in Vietnam. They are not at the stage to say "We the people," but when they do get to that stage, then things will be fine.

Again, I thank you very, very much for this occasion, and I wish the new group that is going out there all of the best of luck and I am sure you will find a wonderful setup in the American forces.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

NAACP'S 55TH ANNUAL CONVENTION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following remarks taking notice of and directing the attention of my colleagues in both Houses to the 55th Annual Convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. During this entire week, the officers, delegates, and friends of this magnificent organization will be reflecting upon recent events and planning ahead for the long struggle for full compliance and equal opportunity under law.

Mr. Speaker, it is very significant that this meeting immediately follows passage in the U.S. Senate of the first comprehensive Civil Rights Act since 1875. That this event and the eventual final enactment of the law are landmarks in the history of the Nation will be duly noted by the NAACP convention speakers and delegates. It is fitting, then, that this great association meets in Washington, the seat of the Nation's Government, at such a propitious moment.

The lengthy and bitter fight to obtain equality under law for all Americans has indeed reached a critical stage. In the forefront of that campaign over the last 55 years, the NAACP has been the undisputed leader among all organizations, past and present, which have made significant contributions to the movement.

Mr. Speaker, when the all-Negro Niagara movement merged with the racially mixed group of conscientious and freedom-loving Americans in New York, in 1909, the NAACP was born. Since that time, the association has been a model of Negro-white cooperation in the fields of civil rights and race relations. Thus, the NAACP has demonstrated clearly to the Nation and the world, what can be accomplished when Ameri-

can citizens of every race, from every locale, and with varied socio-economic backgrounds combine their resources and concentrate on the most vital unfinished business of the American Republic—the movement to obtain equal status and treatment under law for every American, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.

In the area of legal action the NAACP has no peers. Its record of cases won in the courts of the land, and especially before the U.S. Supreme Court, is a signal tribute to the justice of its cause and the ability of its legal staff. On the local scene, its 1,762 branches, youth and college chapters in 49 States are ever vigilant and highly effective in resolving civil rights problems, often without the intervention of the national office. These are local people working on local problems within a local context. The fact that their activity results in restructuring local race relations is indicative of the great neglect and severe injustices which have too long existed in too many communities. They cannot be praised too highly.

Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as a "typical year" in the history of the association. Every year stands out as a year of progress marked with varying degrees of disappointment and occasioned by some stark tragedies. However, in no year has the association been content to rest upon its past accomplishments; but rather it has kept flailing away toward the destruction of racial discrimination and segregation wherever it existed and in whatever form it reared its ugly head. The NAACP has always been truly in the vanguard of the movement for equal rights.

Certainly among its notable accomplishments has been its almost single-handed fight against legal murder in the form of lynching—a fight which has seen the incidence of lynching disappear and, with it, the destruction of the main weapon in the "rule of fear" tactics of segregationist bigots. But death is still a consequence of vigorous civil rights activity and violence is a constant companion of or threat to every civil rights worker. Vivid demonstrations of this were seen in the tragic deaths of NAACP Field Secretaries Harry Moore, of Florida, in 1951, and more recently, Medgar Evers, of Mississippi. These acts of criminal violence vividly underscore the need for strong and continuous protection of the rights of Negroes to life, liberty, and equality.

Other organizations make important contributions to the movement for equal rights, too. However, their existence and successes in no wise constitute challenges to the leadership which so consistently and vigorously has been provided by the NAACP. In fact, these organizations are not only compatible with and complementary to the NAACP, but they are also largely dependent upon the association which furnishes the bulk of the successful legal action that turns victories won in the streets and public squares into permanent and progressive developments in American constitutional law.

While legal action is not by any means the only activity the NAACP undertakes,

it is certainly one of the most important in terms of the numbers and the significance of the cases. One need only recall the invalidation of the White Primary, in *Smith v. Allwright* (1944); the bar to court enforcement of racial restrictive covenants, in *Shelley v. Kraemer* (1948); and the voiding of public school segregation by race, in *Brown v. Topeka* (1954-55).

During the past year alone, the legal action affiliate of the NAACP, the legal defense and education fund, defended 10,487 persons arrested in peaceful demonstrations against racial discrimination; represented Negro Americans in 30 cases presented to the U.S. Supreme Court for review; maintained a staff of 12 attorneys in New York supplemented by 102 lawyers in various southern communities; and fought 168 separate groups of legal actions in 15 States. Within the limits of its budget and the trends in constitutional law, the NAACP refuses no case and enlarges each year its contribution to the equal rights movement and the growth of our living constitution. Thus, the LDEF and the NAACP have forged and fashioned the law by presenting to and winning before the Supreme Court virtually all of the major cases involving racial equality.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress to salute at this time the following: First, NAACP executive secretary Roy Wilkins, this year's recipient of the coveted Spingarn Medal, awarded annually by the NAACP; second, national president for 24 years, Arthur B. Spingarn, successor to his brother, Joel, who was president for 20 years; third, chairman of the board of directors, Bishop Stephen G. Spottswood; fourth, Washington bureau director, Clarence Mitchell, who is certainly no stranger to Capitol Hill and for whom I know you have the highest regard and respect; fifth, legal counsels, Robert Carter and Jack Greenberg, successors to Thurgood Marshall and, like him, titans of the legal profession; sixth, Gloster B. Current, director of branches; seventh, Henry Lee Moon, director of publicity, and James Ivy, editor, the Crisis, official organ of the NAACP; and eighth, the more than 500,000 rank-and-file members of the association who really are the NAACP at the local level.

It is fitting, too, that we salute, in memoriam, Moorfield Story, first president of the NAACP; Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, as founder the Niagara movement and the NAACP; Mary White Ovington, a founder and long-time officeholder; Charles Houston, first full-time legal counsel and architect of the legal assault on racial segregation; Walter White, illustrious, flamboyant former executive secretary; and James Weldon Johnson, poet, composer, statesman, educator, and former executive secretary.

Because of its dedication to freedom and equality; because of its unmatched contribution to the civil rights revolution; because of its consistent and outstanding leadership; because of its vivid demonstration of the fruits of Negro-white cooperation; and because its cause and its position are right, I call upon all of the Members of Congress to hail the

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. Speaker, last night, NAACP executive secretary Roy Wilkins became the 49th recipient of the coveted Spingarn Medal, the association's highest tribute for achievement in furthering the movement for racial equality. On Monday night, Mr. Wilkins delivered a brilliant keynote address at the first general session of this year's NAACP convention. I now include the text of that speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY ROY WILKINS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, BEFORE ITS 55TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 22, 1964

We gather here in the Capital of our country in the 55th annual convention of our association in a truly historic moment for our constituency, for our Nation, and for our trouble-torn world.

One year ago we had taken from us our courageous and inspiring Mississippi leader, Medgar W. Evers. The man who took his life in a cruelly futile effort to stop the movement of history contributed instead to the surge of last Friday. Medgar truly gave his life for his people.

Ten years ago the segregation and the cheating of our children in the public school system was struck down as unconstitutional. The resistance to that ruling and the open defiance of it, including the shameless persecution of the youngsters who sought their rights, contributed to the moment of history on June 19, 1964.

Seven months ago today on November 22, 1963, our President was assassinated in a region where hatred had been practiced so long and so respectably on Negro citizens and on their aspirations that its transference to even a President of the United States was easy. The civil rights haters did not kill John Fitzgerald Kennedy, but they created a climate which was not hostile to a killing over a difference in policy.

The anger and anguish they stirred helped to write into the history books, exactly 1 year after President Kennedy's civil rights message, the step he felt necessary for the Nation—his beloved Nation—to take. One sentence in his memorable message haunts us with its all-American truth: "I ask you," he said, "to look into your hearts, not in search of charity—for the Negro neither wants nor needs condescension—but for the one plain, proud, and priceless quality that unites us all as Americans: a sense of justice."

So it came about that only 72 hours ago, almost to this very hour, the United States of America took another giant step forward toward the attainment of the ideals set forth by the founders when the Senate passed the long-debated civil rights bill by a vote of 73 to 27.

Our country has fought over and won the long battles for freedom of the press, for freedom of religion, for the rights of labor, including child labor, for the rights of women, for due process of law, and for a dozen lesser, but important vindications of the rights of man. On June 19, 1964, by action of the Senate upon a bill previously passed by the House, our country reaffirmed its dedication to human rights without distinction as to the race and color of the humans.

This was another in the succession of soul searchings, heart wringings, conscience wrappings, and political maneuverings that has marked America's struggle with the problem of bringing the descendants of former slaves, people of another color, under the Western democratic concepts of citizenship equality and individual freedom protected by law. Not, mind you, by custom or happenstance or caprice or local option, but by law.

This is the basic message of what will shortly become the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The legislation addresses itself to specific discriminations in voting, public accommodations, employment, public education, and the use of Federal funds. It provides ways in which such grievances may be redressed, all based upon the responsibility of the Federal Government to act to protect individual rights against abridgment or denial by the States.

These specifics are helpful, will be invoked and, despite dire predictions from foes of the bill and skeptical observations from some civil rights advocates, will benefit the Negro sufferers. But the principal value, the value above all others, is the recognition finally—by the Congress of the United States that the Negro is a constitutional citizen. Nor is this a value accruing to the Negro alone. Every white American shares it. Every conscience, whether boldly or secretly or in a sort of blustering reluctance, is proud today of our country and its citizens.

Many hands and minds and hearts brought victory. Since last July 2, a formidable group of national Negro, labor, church, Jewish, civic, fraternal, and women's organizations has been at work under the banner of the leadership conference on civil rights of which your secretary has been chairman for many years. Funds were contributed by the organizations themselves.

Organized labor gave generously in money, skilled staff personnel, and in office space. The work of the church groups was magnificent, so much so that the churches were honored by Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, leader of the opposition, by being denounced in unrestrained terms. Our NAACP held a legislative conference last August with 650 delegates from 36 States meeting here to press for the bill. Weekly meetings of Washington legislative agents have been held since September which means that in both the House and Senate every man and every development was covered on a daily basis.

The man in charge of this day-in, day-out, week-in, week-out, month-in, month-out operation was one who deserves your very special thanks and acclaim, our own Clarence Mitchell.

Men in both parties deserve thanks. In the House, 138 Republicans joined 152 Democrats to make the total of 290 for the bill; in the Senate, 27 out of 33 Republicans voted for cloture with 44 Democrats to make that precedent-shattering vote of 71 to 29. On final passage 27 Republicans along with 46 Democrats made history in a 73-to-27 vote.

A rollcall would take too long, but the leaders in the House were Representatives CARL ALBERT and EMANUEL CELLER, Democrats; and Representatives CHARLES HALLECK and WILLIAM MCCULLOCH, Republicans. In the Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD and Republican Minority Leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, along with the floor managers, Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and THOMAS KUCHEL shepherded the bill through.

Senator DIRKSEN was the key man in the Senate engagement whose speech just before the cloture vote on the debt America owes the Negro citizens who fought for democracy in two World Wars was a classic.

The White House, as everyone knows, was not passive or neutral or secretive in its attitude and this plain position, needless to say, had its effect on the Hill. President Johnson gave no opportunity to congressional leaders to complain that they did not know where the President stood.

As there are at every such leap forward, we have today those who, whether they intend it or not, deprecate the accomplishment by announcing what the civil rights bill will not do, whom it will not benefit. They seem to relegate it to the background by announcing, before it becomes law, what they intend to do the minute it becomes law. These critical observers seem to be disconcerted at

the emergence of a law as their ally in the struggle for human rights.

If the new law-to-be is as limited and ineffectual as they imply, one wonders why its proposal aroused every incipient Fascist in the Nation, why a Mississippi-financed lobby spent more than \$300,000 to defeat it, why the extreme leftists, including the Communists, sneered at it, why the official reaction in Moscow is that it will not be enforced, why a major political party is split wide open on the issue, and why Gov. George C. Wallace, of the State made famous by dogs, firehoses, guns, clubs, and the bomb murders of little girls, is using the bill as hate-campaign material?

The NAACP welcomes the law as an ally in the onward struggle. No sane person contends that the bill solves all problems, but we intend to use it, to urge our people to use it and to employ every legitimate means to secure its enforcement. We learned in 1946 that a bill on one phase would not do. We learned in 1957 that only a part of a voting bill could be enacted and in 1960 we got that upgraded. Now, in 1963-64 we got a bill with 10 titles, the most comprehensive ever drawn. We worked hard for its enactment and we don't intend to damn it with faint praise, with "buts" and "ifs" and "we'll see." We will not only use our own resources, but we join the late President Kennedy and President Johnson in the call for action by Government, industry, and private agencies to secure compliance.

We were occupied in the year since our last convention with other activities besides the major project of the civil rights bill. We participated in the March on Washington last August, even though by reading a certain magazine of a Chicago publishing firm one would never guess that the NAACP was within 1,000 miles of the March. Your NAACP put in staff personnel and about \$14,000 in cash. It also put up a deposit of about \$20,000 to guarantee the loudspeaker systems. The March was a miracle of cooperation between organizations, including three major faiths, a miracle of skilled organization and promotion and a miracle of dedication on the part of the 210,000 white and Negro participants. It made history with its clear call for human dignity, a call that rang around the world and even in the minds and hearts of the members of the opposition.

Our association was occupied also with achieving the greatest membership in its history, 534,710, at the very time the analysts and civil rights commentators were reciting its obituary in the face of the advent of the "new militants." I see by today's papers that one of the segments of one of the new militants has a membership of 110 in a city containing roughly 450,000 to 500,000 Negro residents, certainly an arresting indication of the community endorsement of that unit.

The NAACP had 75 branches in 1963 of 1,000 members or more with Chicago at the top with 33,708 members. Eight branches had 10,000 or more members and among the States New York led all others with 50,000 members.

The branches, large and small, sent \$807,500 in membership fees and freedom fund money to the national office, not counting \$169,700 in subscriptions to the Crisis magazine. This makes a rough total of \$977,200 from the branches alone. If we add in \$21,000 from members-at-large, we have just short of \$1 million from within our own organization. I have given this detail not only to make you proud of your national record, but to try once more to strike down that persistent falsehood that the NAACP is supported financially by white people and says and does only what its white donors tell it to say.

We welcome support from all liberty-loving people. We draw no color line in our membership or in our accounting department. But in the NAACP the members pay

the way of the association. Friends and well-wishers help (and we need more of their help) but our own membership is the backbone of the strength of the NAACP.

We were busy during the year on every phase of the civil rights program in not one single city, but across the Nation. In Tacoma it was housing; in Cleveland, employment; in Oxnard, Calif., schools; in Boston, a school boycott; in Oklahoma and Kansas City, public accommodation laws; in Mississippi, school desegregation lawsuits; in North Carolina and Florida, restaurant discrimination; in Elizabeth and New Brunswick, N.J., a tutoring program for shaky students; in Gary, Ind., a voter campaign behind a candidate for coroner; in Philadelphia and New York City, jobs in the construction industry. All across the country, Jim Crow, in whatever form he raised his head, was opposed by flexible NAACP activity, adapted to the problem, to the locality and to the resources available.

We won a major battle in the continuing struggle in Prince Edward County, Va., when the courts ordered the county to reestablish a public school system.

We won another battle for our association and for freedom of speech and association when the Supreme Court ruled that Alabama, the only State that excludes the NAACP, must permit us to organize and function there. We expect to get our reorganization drive underway before the summer is gone and we intend for this convention next year in Denver to welcome home the delegates from our Alabama branches.

We propose this year to press our entire program at an accelerated pace. The work of the civil rights movement is done through many methods, some spectacular and some not so dramatic. It must go on. We intend to keep pushing along the whole front, not afraid of a new idea or a new method, but not afraid to toss out the ideas that are more exotic than they are useful. We will draw much of the energy for this from our very fine NAACP youth councils and college chapters who form the largest organized youth group in the civil rights movement—nearly 80,000 strong.

We will aim at strengthening our allies in the majority population, since a numerical minority must have allies if it is to succeed. We will not sacrifice one goal or one principle in seeking friends, but we will try to expand a policy of true militant responsibility as against reckless adventurism.

We intend to use the ballot on a wider scale. At present, in addition to our southern voter-registration campaign, we have organized voter-registration efforts in 300 northern and western cities. We are getting ready for whatever develops in this election year. Already we have pledged ourselves to support those Congressmen and Senators who voted for the civil rights bill. We will do this.

We shall try, insofar as is within our power, to give the special case of Senator Goldwater special attention. While looking at him we must look at his backers. In his speech June 18 explaining why he would vote "no" on the civil right bill, Senator Goldwater said:

"I believe . . . some law can help, but not law that embodies features like these . . . which require for their effective execution the creation of a police state."

The bulletin of the John Birch Society for February 8, 1964, asserts:

"The Civil Rights Act of 1963, if enacted, will be the first major legal step in establishing a brutal totalitarian police state over the American people."

Who was following whom?

The new reapportionments within the States will lend assistance to the civil rights cause by giving the white and Negro urban voter the strength to which they are entitled.

To carry on the campaign we will seek more funds and in this quest we will be aided by the new NAACP special contribution fund, which enjoys tax deductibility.

Our legal work in the NAACP itself, our voter-registration work, our community education programs and selected other parts of our activity can be generously aided by those who must have deductibility for income tax purposes. The Internal Revenue Service recently approved the new fund enabling us to expand the nonlobbying parts of our program.

We welcome and will aid the President's antipoverty program. Our people desperately need education, vocational and other. We need a far-reaching youth program. We need retraining for our adults. We need all manner of guidance and assistance in both the cities and rural areas.

We need the lifting of racial barriers in employment if the Nation is not to create a permanently unemployed class composed predominantly of our people. To help avoid this the NAACP has given a new priority and a new urgency to its efforts in behalf of Negro workers. The hiring practices of the giant General Motors Corp. and the exclusionist policies of some of the mighty building trades unions have both come under attack in the weeks immediately preceding this convention.

Finally, we wish to push our cause by expanding efforts within our own group to build the strengths necessary for achievement in a nonsegregated society. We must seek excellence, old-fashioned excellence, that scorns the getting by philosophy. We must not be afraid to raise and to demand adherence to the standards by which many of us and many of our fathers grew up in the world: truth, honesty, morality, justice, and regard for law and order.

The vast bulk of our people does not condone crime. But we resent deeply the attempts to tie every crime of violence to the civil rights movement. We resent the implication that our leaders should be responsible for the acts of every purse snatcher, or drug addict, or murderer. We are a population of 20 million people. That number anywhere on earth has its share of criminals and eccentrics. We condemn criminality. We will join in any legitimate effort to get at the root causes of it.

We urge our people not to hide behind race prejudice as an excuse for the inexcusable. But we do not intend that the great and just surge for decency and dignity shall be smeared by indicting 20 million people for the sins of the few.

We have fine people to give to America to add to those already given in generations past. The mother of Wilma Rudolph carried her child to a foot clinic 50 miles away every week for 2 years so that later, when the chance came, Wilma could win gold medals for her country in the Olympic games. Leontyne Price, the golden-voiced Metropolitan Opera star, came from Laurel, Miss. Willie Mays did not believe what they told him in Birmingham and went on to where he is today—the highest salaried player in baseball.

The University of Texas has engaged a Negro professor of civil engineering to its faculty. Out in California a 72-year-old Negro handyman won his high school diploma after he had sent 10 children through college.

These and millions like them are the people America cannot afford to throw away in a program of senseless racial restrictions. We need them and the new South needs them. These are the people the civil rights bill would multiply. These are the people in whose behalf the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is privileged to fight. These are the people who, while solving the race problem, could well save Western democratic society itself.

BILL TO INCREASE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS BY 6 PERCENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today would provide for a 6-percent increase in social security benefits for all present and future beneficiaries. An across-the-board 6-percent benefit increase is one of the most urgently needed improvements in the social security program at this time; it will have a significant impact both for the nearly 20 million social security beneficiaries who will get an immediate increase in their monthly checks, and for our economy as a whole. It is estimated that, if my bill were in effect, an additional \$1 billion would be paid out in cash social security benefits in 1965.

The last general increase in social security benefits was enacted in 1958 and became effective in 1959. Since 1959, the cost of living has gone up more than 5 percent and earnings have gone up over 20 percent. Active workers have shared to some extent in the fruits of increased production through wage increases so that, even though prices have risen, they are generally better off as a result of the expansion in the economy. Retired people getting social security benefits, on the other hand, have experienced the full weight of the increase in prices since 1959, when the last general increase in social security benefits became effective, without any compensating increase in their income. Those who must live solely on their benefits—and about half have no other significant income they can count on—find it extremely difficult to absorb even a small increase in prices. For those already on the social security benefit rolls this 6-percent benefit increase will make up for the increase in the cost of living since 1959; it will restore the purchasing power of the social security benefit dollar. Today, social security retirement benefits for people who start to draw them at age 65 range in amount from \$40 to \$127 a month; under my bill they would range from \$42.40 up to \$134.70 a month. The average retirement benefit for a retired worker in June 1963 was \$73—under my bill it would be increased to \$77.40; the average benefit for a retired couple—about \$129 in June 1963—would go up to \$135.80 a month.

In introducing this bill to increase benefits by 6 percent, I am deeply concerned with the importance of keeping benefits up to date for people coming on the benefit rolls in the future. I am also vitally aware of the need for an increase in social security benefits at this time from the standpoint of our economy as a whole. The 6-percent benefit increase will make a significant contribution toward strengthening our economy and keeping it moving firmly ahead.

The money paid out in social security benefits under my bill would move quickly into circulation and would provide an important stimulus to our economy. It would provide purchasing power and create increased consumer demand not only among social security beneficiaries but throughout our population. Younger workers—people with their own growing families to support—would be to some extent relieved of the financial burden that they might otherwise have of helping also to support their aged parents. To the extent that social security benefits are increased so that they will more nearly meet the needs of our aged people and enable them to live in comfort and independence, the economic well-being of all groups in our population will be substantially improved. In this regard, the 6-percent social security benefit increase that my bill provides would have a significant impact on the poverty problem in the United States. The aged—particularly those who are retired—are among the poorest groups in our population today. Social security benefits are the chief source of support for the retired aged and a 6-percent increase in these benefits is an important step in the effort to reduce and alleviate poverty. It would provide a necessary adjustment in the social security program as well as a substantial improvement in the economic situation of the aged.

These improvements in social security benefit amounts are important in themselves; they are particularly significant when considered in connection with H.R. 10936, which I introduced in April. H.R. 10936 would increase from \$1,200 to \$2,000 the annual amount that a social security beneficiary can earn and still get all his social security benefits. As I pointed out in my statement introducing H.R. 10936, many people getting social security benefits are healthy and able bodied and should not be prevented from remaining active in the economic life of the Nation by the unrealistic limit of \$1,200 on outside earnings. The \$800 increase in the amount a person can earn and still get all his benefits will encourage those beneficiaries who are able and want to earn more to do so. At the same time the 6-percent benefit increase will provide higher benefits for those who cannot work and earn substantial amounts. Beneficiaries will have a more realistic choice and a greater freedom to work or not work, according to their abilities and desires. In either case, the Nation will benefit by the more effective participation of beneficiaries in our economic life—by their increased contribution to production or by their increased social security checks.

I ask every Member of the House to join me in supporting this legislation.

NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, with National Safe Boating Week again approaching I welcome this opportunity

to present this progress report on recreational boating safety.

First of all, I should like to announce that in accordance with Public Law 85-445 which I sponsored in the 85th Congress, the President of the United States on February 12 of this year issued the following proclamation:

Whereas recreational boating has become a leading outdoor activity for millions of Americans who enjoy this healthful and relaxing use of leisure time; and

Whereas education of the boating public in safe practices contributes to the enjoyment of the sport and reduces the likelihood of accidents; and

Whereas continuing cooperation between organizations and individuals interested in boating is necessary to insure safe boating throughout the year; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in recognizing the need for emphasis on boating safety, by a joint resolution approved June 4, 1958 (72 Stat. 179), has requested the President to proclaim annually the week which includes July 4 as National Safe Boat Week: Now, therefore,

I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning June 28, 1964, as National Safe Boating Week.

In furtherance of the objectives of this proclamation, I strongly urge that all individuals, boating organizations, the boating industry, and Government agencies, both State and Federal, dedicated to safer recreational boating, publicize and observe National Safe Boating Week, and extend their effort throughout the year.

I also invite the Governors of the States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and other areas subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to join in the observance of this week in order to draw nationwide attention to the importance of safety in recreational boating.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this 12th day of February in the year of our Lord, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 188th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The proclamation clearly indicates the importance that the President attaches to boating safety.

SCOPE OF BOATING

To give you some idea of the tremendous scope of recreational boating, I should like to present a few figures:

Industry estimates that 38,390,000 persons participated in recreational boating during 1963, spending \$2,581 million in retail purchasing for new and used boats, motors, accessories, fuel, safety equipment, insurance, docking, maintenance, launching, storing, repairs, and club memberships. That is very big business. They also estimate that 7,678,000 recreational boats are in existence and that there are 5,230 marinas, boatyards, and yacht clubs with waterfront stations in the United States. Our people are utilizing the inland waters, rivers, coastal waterways and Great Lakes systems to a greater extent than ever before. One of the greatest advantages of water recreational activities is that it does not cost anything to use our waterways. Water recreation is one of the few areas where enjoyment has not been dimmed by over-taxation or overregulation.

The safety aspects of boating are of steadily increasing concern to the U.S.

Coast Guard which is the Federal agency with primary responsibility for safety of life and property upon the water. Boating safety has drawn the attention of the Congress, the legislatures of every State, and of the press. Private organizations, such as those which support National Safe Boating Week, have been giving this subject greater emphasis each year.

When you consider the potential for accidents on the water it becomes immediately evident that we must continue our efforts in boating safety education.

The statistical report for calendar year 1963 was published on May 1, 1964, and it is my understanding that each Member of Congress received a copy. This report is a result of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 which directs the Coast Guard to compile, analyze, and publish information obtained on boating accidents. I would like to call your attention to several portions of the report. Compared with 1962, there was a decrease in the total of boats numbered but an increase in accidents. This could be attributed to duplication of numbering in the period from 1959 through 1962 which was corrected in reregistration during 1963. Also the small increase in accidents is probably due to better reporting rather than a real increase in the number of accidents. However, of concern is the high percentage of deaths caused by capsizing, which remains the same, 42 percent. The problem of capsizing includes such factors as boat design, operator education and law enforcement. It is not a problem that can be overcome overnight. However, the Advisory Panel of State Officials to the Merchant Marine Council of the Coast Guard has recommended the adoption of a safe loading capacity formula by the boating industry and the affixing of a safe loading plate to each motorboat. The formula to be used was developed through close consultation between representatives from the Coast Guard and boating industry. The capacity plate to be used will guide the boatowner as to the number of persons and amount of weight which can be safely carried in his boat. The States are being encouraged to enact legislation requiring the display of such a capacity plate on all motorboats. We are not considering proposals for Federal regulations because there are no provisions under the Motorboat Act of 1940 which would provide for such regulations. Also, it would be extremely difficult to provide the Coast Guard with appropriate legislation with the necessary speed. There is the further consideration that such regulations would apply only to the operators of those motorboats using navigable waters of the United States. We feel that the States are in a better position than the Coast Guard to regulate the manufacture and sale of motorboats which will be required to be labeled with a safe loading capacity plate.

PROGRESS IN THE FIELD OF RECREATIONAL BOATING

One of the most significant advances in recreational boating safety was the establishment of the Recreational Boating Safety Division at Coast Guard Headquarters on January 1, 1964. The Division is responsible for the coordina-

tion of all Coast Guard activities related to recreational boating. Previously these activities were divided between two offices at headquarters, education and enforcement in the Office of Operations and numbering, and equipment in the Office of Merchant Marine Safety. The responsibilities of this new Division are:

To direct the enforcement program applicable to recreational boating including plans for the selection, training, guidance, and deployment of enforcement personnel; supervise the Federal numbering of undocumented vessels; maintain liaison with Federal and State agencies having related interests, develop and coordinate arrangements and agreements with State governments for cooperation in the enforcement of State and Federal boating laws; develop boating accident reporting procedures and administer the program for compiling, analyzing, and publishing the data thus obtained, together with recommendations for the enhancement of boating safety. This is a very big job. But, it must be done. Pursuant to the Federal Boating Act of 1958 two additional States, Maine and Pennsylvania, enacted motorboat numbering laws which were approved by the Coast Guard in January of this year. This brings to 45 the number of States numbering undocumented vessels in accordance with the Federal system, plus the Virgin Islands.

On April 23, 1964, after close liaison with the Coast Guard and State boating law administrators, the Department of Transport, Canada, amended their small vessel regulations to grant reciprocity to U.S. pleasure boats operating in Canadian waters. U.S. pleasure boats now visiting Canada and equipped in accordance with U.S. Coast Guard regulations are considered to be in conformance with the Canadian regulations. Further, a boat brought into Canada by a U.S. tourist and not remaining in Canada need not have a Canadian license—number—or Department of Transport boat capacity plate, provided that the usual customs permit is obtained.

In October 1961, the Advisory Panel of State Officials to the Merchant Marine Council of the U.S. Coast Guard adopted the uniform waterway marking system which was subsequently endorsed by the Coast Guard. This system provides for the uniform marking of channels, posting of regulatory markers and information signs on nonnavigable waters of the United States and on those waters where the Coast Guard does not maintain aids to navigation to support the needs of the Armed Forces or commerce. To date this system has been adopted in 28 States, is pending in 7 and it is also being considered by 2 others. This is another of the remarkable accomplishments which has been brought about by continuing roundtable conferences between State boating authorities, the Coast Guard, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and other interested agencies and organizations.

The National Park Service, Department of the Interior has recently promulgated regulations governing water-use

activities in the national park system which are intended to:

First. Establish uniform regulations for water-use activities throughout the Park Service and to insure their nationwide applications.

Second. Delete obsolete and imprecise regulations to permit maximum use of water resources.

Third. Parallel U.S. Coast Guard boating regulations pertaining to navigable waters.

Fourth. Provide for health, safety, and welfare of persons and property.

Fifth. Conserve and protect park values; and consolidate all Park Service boating regulations.

EDUCATION

Because the human element is by far the most important factor in safe boating the Coast Guard relies heavily on education and persuasion. Through its boating films, safety publications, auxiliary programs, and by utilization of the personnel assigned to the Mobile Boarding Detachments in public education activities the Coast Guard takes advantage of every opportunity to stress boating safety. When examining motorboats to determine compliance with the Federal requirements, which are after all only minimum standards for safety, boarding officers point out and explain all violations detected and any other unsafe conditions noted. Vessels observed to be operating in an unsafe manner are stopped and the operators are advised of the hazards involved and of their responsibilities.

The Coast Guard Auxiliary, as a civilian voluntary adjunct of the regular Coast Guard, was established by Congress in 1939 to promote safer and more efficient operation of motorboats and through their programs, foster better compliance with recreational boating laws and regulations. In addition to public instruction and courtesy motorboat examination programs, auxiliaries participate in the patrol of regattas, emergency operations in times of distress for or with the Coast Guard. Auxiliary operations are always on a voluntary basis.

The auxiliary has continued to expand its public service while at the same time maintaining its high quality. There are presently 791 flotillas located in 644 communities throughout the Nation and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. At the end of 1963 membership was 22,109, of which 7,423 were qualified to perform courtesy motorboat examinations. In 1963 the auxiliary was credited with saving 306 lives, with assisting in 6,017 distress cases, and with patrolling 2,474 races and regattas. In addition this organization conducted 165,461 courtesy motorboat examinations and facility inspections, instructed 136,353 in safe boating practices and showed boating safety films to audiences totaling 2,712,414.

The reputation of the Coast Guard Auxiliary for its efficiency in the examination of pleasure craft is such that the decal issued by the auxiliary is officially accepted in 41 States as evidence of compliance with the State boating laws. Usually boats displaying this decal are not stopped and examined by the Coast

Guard or by enforcement personnel in these 41 States.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Law enforcement is, to a degree, supplementary to the educational program. The explosive growth of recreational boating since the late 1940's, the advent of boat trailers and the development of water recreation areas throughout the Nation continue to overtax law enforcement resources, both Federal and State. Since the personnel to fully enforce the boating laws are insufficient and in many cases inexperienced, measures are being developed to best utilize those available. The Coast Guard is working closely with the States and other Federal agencies to train enforcement officers with a view toward uniformity in enforcement.

During 1963, the Coast Guard mobile boarding detachments trained 3,822 Coast Guard personnel and 995 State and local enforcement officers. Not only does this training provide for uniform enforcement, it also fosters closer cooperation between the various jurisdictions. It is not unusual to see the Coast Guard and the local deputy sheriffs working hand in hand in areas where a concentrated effort is required. In other areas safety patrols are closely coordinated by the various agencies to avoid duplication of effort and harassment of the boater.

One of the most effective and efficient safety patrol measures carried out by the Coast Guard is its mobile boarding program. These safety patrols, recently reduced to three men each due to limited operating funds, are equipped with a truck, boat, and trailer. The boat and vehicle also employ two-way radios for coordination of law enforcement and rescue activities. During 1963, these 35 teams operated in 44 of the 50 States. Of the six States in which the teams did not operate four of them have adequate coverage by permanent Coast Guard units, the remaining two, New Mexico and Kansas may be visited by these teams when the need for such activity is indicated.

During the past year the Coast Guard boarded and examined 203,701 motorboats. The mobile boarding detachments alone boarded 104,269 motorboats citing 36,762 of them for violations. In addition to the safety patrol and law enforcement training performed by these units, they were utilized in public education programs, factory inspection of Coast Guard approved life saving devices, flood relief details, and the patrol of regattas. When you note that all of this work was performed by only 120 enlisted men operating independently in remote areas with a minimum of supervision you must give them a deserved "well done." They have generally been enthusiastically received by the public for the resulting safer conditions in spite of the high percentage of violations cited. However, they are limited in number and time. We have, therefore, had to refuse many requests for more frequent visits by these detachments.

FUTURE PLANS, NEEDS, AND PREDICTIONS

Many new water areas have been developed or are being planned, and we ex-

pect that boating activities with their attendant problems will continue to increase. Future planning in safety education and law enforcement will require the continued cooperation and effort of all those having a responsibility in these fields.

Boating educational organizations, such as the Coast Guard Auxiliary, the U.S. Power Squadrons, the American Red Cross, and the Boy Scouts of America, must not only continue their present fine efforts but will need to expand them. In this connection, the education of schoolchildren by certain State agencies and other organizations is a program designed to pay both immediate and future dividends.

The number of law enforcement officers should be increased. Also, to fully utilize available enforcement personnel—both Federal and State—a program, under section 9 of the Federal Boating Act must be initiated. This section specifically encourages agreements and other arrangements between the Coast Guard and various States in law enforcement. This would, among other things, permit the efficient deployment of personnel and facilities and minimize the possibility of duplication.

As previously mentioned, 45 States have federally approved numbering systems. We believe that public demand will cause the remaining five States to enact the necessary boating laws within the next few years.

Progress in boating safety has been rapid since the enactment of the Federal Boating Act, but it will need the unflagging efforts of Government, business, and private organizations, and, above all—the boating public if this progress is to continue.

NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK

This year National Safe Boating Week, which includes the Fourth of July period, will begin on June 28. As the motto for this week we should all join in saying—"Let's stress safe boating the whole year around."

The continued success of this annual observance is particularly gratifying to the Coast Guard and to its civilian affiliate, the Coast Guard Auxiliary, as well as to the many others who have supported this event.

This year the National Safe Boating Week Committee has done an excellent job of promoting and coordinating this event. This committee includes representatives from: the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, the American Boat and Yacht Council, the American National Red Cross, the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts, the National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers, the American Powerboat Association, the National Safe Boating Association, the National Safety Council, the Outboard Boating Club of America, the U.S. Power Squadrons, the Yacht Safety Bureau, the American Water Ski Association, and the Young Men's Christian Association.

This program focuses nationwide attention on the problems of boating safety and helps to implant safety principles that will be lifesavers during the week,

the boating season, and the lifetime of many boating enthusiasts.

To all those national and local committees actively participating in National Safe Boating Week, I extend my congratulations. I urge all other individuals and organizations interested in boating safety to join in making this, in 1964, the most effective National Safe Boating Week we have ever observed.

JOHN C. BEUKEMA: MUSKEGON'S "MR. SEAWAY"

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in June, 1959, Queen Elizabeth II and President Eisenhower participated in colorful ceremonies at Montreal which marked the official opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The fifth anniversary of that historic occasion, which dramatized a great new venture in United States-Canadian cooperation, will be observed in a memorable way on Saturday, June 27, when dignitaries from both nations gather for an anniversary luncheon at Muskegon, Mich.—a luncheon which will highlight the fourth annual Greater Muskegon Seaway Festival.

At that time, the thriving, growing port of Muskegon will tip its hat and pay tribute to a number of distinguished Canadians and Americans who have played significant roles in the long struggle to transform the dream of an eighth sea into reality.

None will deserve that honor more than Muskegon's own "Mr. Seaway," John C. Beukema.

In its way, the anniversary luncheon will serve as a special tribute and a richly deserved testimonial to this man from Muskegon whose vision, dedication, and strength of purpose have had a profound impact upon the trade routes of the world.

Five years ago, when the date for the official seaway opening was drawing near, Charles H. Woodruff wrote eloquently in the Muskegon Chronicle about the role of John Beukema:

The record of his experiences in the long * * * struggle to secure the seaway legislation is an absorbing account, filled with fact, color, and interest.

But there is more to be told.

The spaces between the lines beg another story; one of almost unexampled devotion to a cause; of fortitude to bear ridicule; of courage to fight on after defeats which wilted the zeal of other men, and of a physical drive and stamina which shames men half his age.

Now that the seaway is reality as the direct result of the second greatest engineering feat of all time, it is important to remember that the old shallow-draft channels would be there today but for what was undoubtedly the longest and most tenacious selling job in the national history.

Through the administrations of seven U.S. Presidents, Mr. Beukema served as master salesman for the project in Michigan, in the Great Lakes States, in Washington, D.C., and even in the violently opposed East.

The difficulties of this selling job can be readily appreciated when it is noted the seaway program was supported by every American President from Harding to Eisen-

however, but was beaten down by organized congressional opposition in every case until that signal day in May (the 6th) of 1954 when the House voted the long-sought approval.

The conviction which prompted and sustained this epic fight stemmed from Mr. Beukema's love of his home community and his dreams for its future greatness. He has worked tirelessly at building Muskegon in many posts and capacities in a wide variety of fields.

His many successes in these efforts brought him deserved community honors in September 1953, when he retired as secretary-manager of the Greater Muskegon Chamber of Commerce after 31 years. This service span of three decades saw many advances in making the Muskegon community a better place for living, industry, and commerce.

His achievements in the work of attracting industry to Muskegon, in rebuilding and encouraging existing industry and in bringing about needed diversification have been many times recognized. Similarly, his work in other fields; for youth, for the war effort, for tourist and resort business, banking needs, and cultural and social endeavors.

He has served as member and officer on more than 25 local boards, and continues this work in retirement. And he has served on an equal number of boards, organizations, and committees on the State and National level, including many years as a charter member and chairman of the State civil service commission.

Along the way he served as member, and most often as chief officer, of virtually every harbor and shipping association representing the Great Lakes. Among them were the Michigan Tidewater Commission (secretary), Great Lakes Harbors Association (thrice president), National Seaway Council (chairman of its executive committee), World Trade Advisory Council, and many others. He has continued work with these associations in retirement and is currently lay counsel to the Harbors Association.

The chief (and richly deserved) honor came in August 1954, 3 months after Congress approved the seaway bill, when President Eisenhower named Mr. Beukema to the five-member St. Lawrence Seaway Advisory Board, placing him at the policymaking level for the greatest marine undertaking ever attempted by the Federal Government on the North American Continent.

The appointment came as no surprise to Muskegon or to Mr. Beukema's associates, but, characteristically, it found him almost incapable of recognizing that the efforts he had expended for so many years in behalf of the waterway program had found cognizance at the national level.

Mr. Beukema led a difficult battle and never lost his optimism despite numerous crushing defeats. Time and again he saw his brightest hopes smashed through the powerful lobby tactics of the seaway's opponents.

He was sustained in this by a great dream of what his community could become as a world port on what now, in effect, is the earth's eighth sea. This dream is now taking on form and substance.

Over the years, John Beukema found that the principal ingredient in the formula for success is hard work. A bit of verse by James Whitcomb Riley has been a long-time favorite; it goes like this:

If you want something, and just dead-set
A-pleading for it with both eyes wet,
And tears won't bring it—why just try sweat
As my uncle ust ter say.

Now, at 75, Muskegon's "Mr. Seaway" is entitled to relax and look back with considerable pride and personal satisfaction upon a long record of distinguished public service. But, as his many

friends and associates well know, John Beukema finds little time for looking back. When he takes a bow at the anniversary luncheon on Saturday, he will be looking forward into the future. So much remains to be done and, as always, John Beukema continues tirelessly, doing more than his share, planning and working in many causes to build a better tomorrow.

A grateful community, as well as his State and the Nation, have good reason to pause on Saturday and salute Muskegon's "Mr. Seaway," John C. Beukema, a great American.

SELECTIVE SERVICE—THE NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW AND CORRECTION REMAINS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read in the newspapers on Monday that the Department of Defense is augmenting and intensifying its planned review of the Nation's manpower policy.

I have stated before that a vigorous analysis is long overdue. The widespread inadequacies and inequities of the draft as it is administered nationwide need immediate attention. Despite certain encouraging signs that the Defense Department is now prepared to give the matter the high priority which it has long demanded, military manpower policy falls directly within the responsibility of the Congress.

I still feel that the provisions of my bill, H.R. 10211, are applicable and I urge that the House enact such legislation. The Congress has the responsibility to ensure that selective service functions both efficiently and equitably. I have spoken before of the inconsistencies which flaw the program. These tend to corrupt the principles and purposes of the system. I think it is equally true that the system presently works counter to the interests of the military services.

The problems of establishing and maintaining a massive and strong-willed fighting force in peacetime are manifold. It is never an easy matter. The currents of opinion run in many directions. Philosophically, the trend toward easing of world tension, and the instinctive bent of the American mind which abhors war, constitutes a force around which it is difficult to build an effective rationalization for universal mandatory training.

Yet, it is remarkable and praiseworthy that the American people have always responded with good will and firm intent when demands were made upon individual liberty to protect the peace. I am confident that we shall continue to sacrifice as long as the demands are rational and legitimate.

And this is the point. It is up to us, here in the Congress, to ascertain through the legislative process whether the draft is necessary to the national security, and if so, how it is to be administered and regulated.

I am not sure that we can ever expect a program of this nature to be absolutely

faultless. What we can do to make it responsive both to military needs and public expression.

To balance these two prerogatives is the responsibility which we cannot shirk. Very often, in real terms, military contingencies conflict with public demands. It is because the military must meet certain criteria which others consider inappropriate or simply cannot understand. It is, basically, the situation of a military establishment subject to popular will.

This is as it should be. I am not arguing against this fundamental principle of democratic government. But it does enlighten us as to the perhaps inherent conflict of interest which arises in peacetime.

Thus, it should be our objective to formulate a manpower policy which reflects both popular acceptance and professional military needs. It is my contention that the administration of the draft does neither.

The first point to be stressed is that although officials of the Defense Department look upon conscription as urgently necessary to meet American commitments and security goals, it is doubtful whether the Army is receiving the unit benefits which should accrue. We must be sure that we understand why the draft exists. It exists because the Nation, as determined by the Government needs to maintain a force level approximating 2.7 million men. And the only reason for maintaining this establishment is to protect the peace and, if necessary, to wage war.

These are fundamentals which too often are lost in heavy oratory. I am not concerned here with whether or not the force determination is correct relative to the exigencies of the national security. I leave that for another time.

The point is that an Army is raised to protect our interests and meet the actuality of war. Without this legitimization, the military budget, the arms arsenal, and the draft lose their justification.

Thus it follows that conscription cannot be rationalized unless it meets a set of military criteria. The draft is acceptable only if it is militarily legitimate. And I am not confident that the Army and those who administer the draft recognize this obligation.

If the draft is to be made respectable, it must be militarily coherent. If it is to be a challenge to our youth, it must be militarily valid. If it is to be a worthwhile experience, it must be militarily legitimate. If it is to constitute a willing fulfillment in service to the Nation, it must be militarily demanding.

The fact is that the vast majority of young men called upon to give service today believe that their service is fraudulent. It does not constitute a challenge. In most cases it will not become worthwhile. For these reasons, it is not respectable. There is serious doubt that military training today, particularly its primary phase, can produce a soldier prepared and disciplined in the art of combat.

I repeat that military training can become valid for the individual soldier only when it is valid militarily. The way toward a legitimate incentive is to make

military training a challenging and worthwhile experience.

It is important to emphasize these factors because they are the fundamentals. All other considerations flow from them. The draft becomes fraudulent and unworthy unless the Nation realizes to the full the ingredients of combat capability which is intended. Because this underlying condition is not being met, the operative principles become corroded by inefficient and inequitable administration.

The evasion mentality is encouraged not only because thousands are able to find an escape hatch, but because it is generally believed that service is a militarily meaningless and undemanding irritant.

Approximately 50 percent of those reaching the age of 26 will never serve actively. The figures reflect a costly enterprise—80 percent of the draftees, and 73 percent of the enlistees, are departing the service after their first tour of duty. The skills and specialties which have been taught are lost. The result in the Army is a constant and disruptive turnover of personnel which would subject any private organization to utter turmoil. Quality becomes a steadily receding potentiality.

I have before me some interesting statistics which were published by the U.S. Continental Army Command at Fort Monroe. I ask unanimous consent that this report on reenlistments, showing results of a questionnaire circulated in May and June of last year, be inserted in the RECORD following the conclusion of my remarks.

The data represents a random opinion taken among 625 Army servicemen. Among those who chose reenlistment, retirement benefits and security were the prime motivating factors. Prestige rated very low; only 7 of the 369 reenlistments seemed to like their duty.

A mere glance at these figures will indicate that we are not composing a challenge to the youth of this country. From a military standpoint, it can be questioned whether those who remain in the service are doing so for the right reasons.

Low pay was the principal reason given for those electing separation.

I hope the discussion here will help in evaluating the need for revision of the draft laws. On previous instances I have touched upon the widespread unfairness and inefficiency of the system. This in itself is a source of the low depths to which mandatory military training has sunk in the public mind. Today I am emphasizing that another primary source of disaffection rests with the training and military experience itself. Concomitantly, it will serve no purpose to make the administration of the laws more equitable without strengthening the fabric of military education where the main incentive must be centered.

I think it is judicious to look forward to the time when manpower requirements can be met by voluntary enlistment. We can learn from the Canadian practice, as the esteemed Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has suggested. Certainly the Army could perform its

function for the better if its forces were voluntarily recruited.

But it is pertinent to reiterate that the Army cannot attract men appropriate to its mission unless it offers a worthy challenge to the courage and vision of the individual person. Military service is a professional occupation. If it can appeal in this vein, it can expect quality and brilliance and valor commensurate with its historic standing as a high profession of men.

This is why I have stated emphatically that correction of the draft practices, and the potential of a fully volunteer force, rests with making military service a respectable experience. It is, rightly, a matter of pride to our young men who are called upon to render service. If the obligation is valid in military terms, the service will be justified in personal terms.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the material referred to earlier at this point in the RECORD:

STATUS REPORT—REPORT OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL SEPARATED AND REENLISTED, USCONARC FORM 170-R (TEST)

1. During May 1963, 625 questionnaires were received in accordance with CON. Reg. 612-202, dated January 23, 1963. Of these, 256 were separations and 369 were reenlistments.

2. Information compiled from the forms is shown below:

(a) Reenlistments and separations by category:

	Total number separated	Total number reenlisted	Percent reenlisted
1st term, Regular Army	283	97	34.3
Career Regular Army	335	272	81.2
AUS inductees	7	0	0
Army reservists and National Guard men	0	0	0
Total	625	369	59.0

(b) Primary reason for reenlisting:

	Frequency reason given				Total
	1st term	Career RA	AUS	USAR and NG	
Retirement benefits	16	160			176
Security	13	34			47
Likes military life	12	31			43
Patriotism	5	14			19
Travel	9	4			13
Likes duty	3	4			7
Education opportunities	16	8			24
Options available	3	0			3
Wife's influence	2	5			7
Training available	9	2			11
Pay	1	1			2
Fringe benefits	0	0			0
Likes assignment	1	2			3
Promotion potential	2	2			4
Prestige	2	0			2
Esprit de corps	0	0			0
Housing	0	0			0
Other	3	5			8
Total	97	272	0	0	369

3. Information on those individuals who did not reenlist shows:

(a) Separations by category:

First term, Regular Army	186
Career, Regular Army	63
Army of the United States inductees	7
Army Reservists and National Guard	0
Total	256

(b) Primary reasons for not reenlisting:

	Frequency reason given				Total
	1st term	Career RA	AUS	USAR and NG	
Low pay	33	11	2		46
Better civilian opportunities	26	6	1		33
No taste for military life	17	2	2		21
Lack of personal freedom	12	0	1		13
Harassment in the unit	11	3	1		15
Leadership in the unit	6	3	0		9
Wife objects	8	5	0		13
Civilian job waiting	16	6	0		22
Civilian college acceptance	8	7	0		15
Promotion policy	14	9	0		23
Dissatisfied with assignment	6	3	0		9
Skills not utilized	8	2	0		10
Personal problems	8	1	0		9
Would be sent overseas	3	2	0		5
Housing situation	2	0	0		2
Fringe benefits	0	1	0		1
Not kept informed	0	0	0		0
Options not available	0	0	0		0
Other	8	2	0		10
Total	186	63	7		256

(c) Secondary reason for not reenlisting:

	Frequency reason given				Total
	1st term	Career RA	AUS	USAR and NG	
Low pay	19	8	1		28
Better civilian opportunities	23	3	0		26
No taste for military life	19	0	1		20
Lack of personal freedom	16	9	0		25
Harassment in the unit	19	4	1		24
Leadership in the unit	9	2	0		11
Wife objects	2	1	0		3
Civilian job waiting	7	1	1		9
Civilian college acceptance	0	0	0		0
Promotion policy	21	14	1		36
Dissatisfied with assignment	9	4	0		13
Skills not utilized	11	4	1		16
Personal problems	6	1	0		7
Would be sent overseas	1	2	0		3
Housing situation	0	0	0		0
Fringe benefits	0	0	0		0
Not kept informed	1	1	0		2
Options not available	0	0	0		0
Total	163	54	6		223

¹ Some individuals gave only 1 reason for not reenlisting.

(d) Third reason for not reenlisting:

	Frequency reason given				Total
	1st term	Career RA	AUS	USAR and NG	
Low pay	12	2	1		15
Better civilian opportunities	19	5	0		24
No taste for military life	11	3	0		14
Lack of personal freedom	16	2	2		20
Harassment in the unit	11	4	0		15
Leadership in the unit	15	5	0		20
Wife objects	1	3	0		4
Civilian job waiting	5	3	0		8
Civilian college acceptance	1	0	0		1
Promotion policy	10	4	0		14
Dissatisfied with assignment	7	1	0		8
Skills not utilized	8	0	0		8
Personal problems	5	2	0		7
Would be sent overseas	0	3	0		3
Housing situation	0	0	1		1
Fringe benefits	1	1	0		2
Not kept informed	7	1	0		8
Options not available	0	0	0		0
Other	3	1	0		4
Total	132	40	4		176

¹ Some individuals gave only 1 reason for not reenlisting.

4. Conclusions:

(a) Retirement benefits and security influence more Regular Army careerists in their decision to reenlist than any other reasons. The first term was influenced mostly by retirement benefits and educational opportunities available in the Army.

(b) Present pay rates and the belief that civilian opportunities are better are the two prime reasons for not reenlisting.

A SIGNIFICANT NEW PLAN FOR FIGHTING URBAN BLIGHT AND DECAY SUGGESTED BY DELAWAREAN

THE SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL], is recognized for 30 minutes.

MR. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a significant new plan for fighting urban blight and decay was suggested by Lawrence Schein, research director of the Community Services Council of Delaware, at a June 18, 1964, meeting in Wilmington, Del., of the Inter-Agency Planning Committee made up of representatives of agencies engaged in physical and social planning in Delaware. According to a report in the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, June 19, Mr. Schein said the Greater Wilmington Development Council might buy up blocks of marginal houses, fix them up and rent them at low profit margins, giving tenants the option to buy. He pointed out that the Woodlawn Trustees have been renting houses at very low rates and keeping them in good repair for many years. He said he believed there are hundreds of these houses in Wilmington. Homeownership in blighted and decaying areas should be encouraged, he said, as a way of creating middle class values and responsible community spirit.

Mr. Schein also suggested, according to the Evening Journal, a human relations clinic for landlords who persistently violate housing laws. He said housing courts could require attendance at seminars where landlords could learn to deal with tenants in ways to get the best cooperation. Mr. Schein suggested the reimposition of rent control as a possibility; and assessment on the basis of profits derived rather than the value of the property which, he said, discourages improvements.

The Evening Journal report stated:

Some low-cost housing should be built in Poplar Street project A, [Mr.] Schein said, to make it possible for Negroes to live there. He said Negroes feel they were deceived when their houses were taken away with no opportunity to move back.

The Washington (D.C.) Post in its June 17 issue reported that Mrs. Robert H. Jacobs, Jr., author of "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," was guest speaker at Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's fifth monthly Women Doers luncheon on June 16 at the White House. President Johnson dropped by to shake hands with each of the guests and to "give a special greeting" to Mrs. Jacobs. Mrs. Jacobs told the women leaders present that the federally aided urban renewal programs which shunt poor people and Negroes out of their homes and accus-

tomed neighborhoods are a "cause for worry."

As if to underscore this point the Washington Post reported that 200 top east coast specialists on city design, attending a recent 2-day conference at Harvard University's Graduate School of Design, declared that the low-income housing efforts of the Federal urban renewal program have been a "complete failure" to date.

Mr. Speaker, the labor movement of our Nation is also deeply concerned over the failure to provide low-income housing, and supports the national housing policy which calls for providing as soon as feasible decent, safe, and sanitary housing for every American family. I commend the United Steelworkers for the new pamphlet, "Citizen Action for Housing and Urban Renewal."

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has called on Congress to wage war on poverty, and has called attention to the central cause and effect of poverty: the ill-housed conditions of literally millions of our fellow citizens. The President is right in saying that the war on poverty must rehouse our fellow citizens who are living in homes of such poor condition that their health and safety is endangered.

I have recently introduced a bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide special assistance for low- and middle-income families. My bill, H.R. 10251, amends section 305 of the National Housing Act to provide that the Federal National Mortgage Association shall exercise its special assistance functions by purchasing mortgages on single-family dwellings for low-income families insured under section 221(d)(2) of such act in order to provide housing for slum dwellers who are not being provided decent, safe, and sanitary housing under the present Federal urban renewal program. That program has provided luxury apartments, and prime office space, but has done little to provide housing for low- and middle-income families, either in our major cities or our small towns and rural areas.

I said on March 11, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 4952-4954, in explanation of my bill, and I repeat here, that I am convinced that my bill, H.R. 10251, will, if adopted, make a major contribution to providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing for our low- and moderate-income families under private enterprise.

I hope the House Special Housing Subcommittee will approve it since it meets a critical need recognized by the Congress in the Housing Act Amendments of 1961, but which the Congress did not adequately provide for.

We would all agree with President Johnson that the perpetuation of poverty in our rich Nation is disgraceful and subversive of our great ideals.

In his testimony before the House Special Housing Subcommittee, FHA Commissioner Philip N. Brownstein justified the provision of vacation houses in the Housing and Community Development Act of 1964 on the grounds that there is a heavy demand for such housing, that we are already a two-automo-

bile-per-family economy, and we are rapidly becoming a two-home-family economy, and, further, that the provision of vacation homes "will stimulate the economy as well as provide a mechanism for the more affluent of our society to get some of the better things that are available."

A housing act which provides vacation homes for the more affluent of our society and does not provide clean, safe, and sanitary housing for low- and moderate-income families cannot be justified.

The effect of my amendment would be to authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase mortgages insured under the FHA section 221(d)(2) program to the extent of \$220 million after the date of the enactment of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1964. The total amount of purchases and commitments authorized would not exceed \$220 million outstanding at any one time.

The February 3, 1964, issue of the Washington World magazine carried an article on a program which is reclaiming and improving homes in slum and blighted areas in Indianapolis, Ind. The article dealt with a new concept of private enterprise which is enabling families with incomes ranging from \$3,000 to \$3,800 to create their own capital by applying their own work and desire for a new home to the improvement and reclamation of rundown neighborhoods.

The novel experiment in Indianapolis, which is comparable in its results and objectives to the proposal made by Lawrence Schein of the Community Services Council of Delaware, is a joint project of three cooperating organizations, Flanner House Homes, Inc., which acts as a major contractor, Flanner House, a settlement house, and the Board of Fundamental Education.

According to the published account in Washington World magazine:

Homeowners replace slum dwellers, the city is cleaned up and relations of the community cemented. Families now have the opportunity to be an actual part of the construction of their new homes, to earn 25 to 36 percent of the value of their home by this initiative investment. The men learn valuable skills while on the job. The women and children, stimulated by the thrill of the project, seek to improve their furnishings. Upholstery and sewing classes, tools and equipment are supplied as a part of the homebuilding program.

I include as part of my remarks the article from the Washington World of February 3, 1964, and the article from the June 19, 1964, issue of the Evening Journal, of Wilmington, Del., on the significant new proposal advanced by Lawrence Schein, research director of the Community Services Council of Delaware. I also include an excerpt from the excellent new pamphlet, "Citizen Action for Housing and Urban Renewal."

[From the Washington World magazine, Feb. 3, 1964]

SELF-HELP HOMES REPLACING SLUMS

A new concept of private enterprise—enabling the individual to create his own capital by applying his own work and his desire for a new home—is one answer to the problem of blighted neighborhoods.

In Indianapolis, Ind., where it's been done successfully, the project is labeled "team-based, guided, self-help homebuilding." In other cities across the country, it's known by other names, but the effect has been the same—to replace slums with new homes for low and marginal income families.

Flanner House Homes, a nonprofit organization, acts as the major contractor for the program. Homeowners replace slum-dwellers, the city is cleaned up and relations of the community cemented. Families now have the opportunity to be an actual part of the construction of their new homes, to earn 25 to 36 percent of the value of their home by this initiative investment. The men learn valuable skills while on the job. The women and children, stimulated by the thrill of the project, seek to improve their furnishings. Upholstery and sewing classes, tools and equipment are supplied as a part of the homebuilding program.

Families who wish to participate are selected by minimal requirements: an income of \$3,500 to \$3,800, enough financial stability to handle the mortgage payments and support of their families, and health enough to work an additional 20 hours a week.

Each builder receives a box of tools, schedules his workweek and is assigned to a work team. Each man in each team is trained for a specific job and performs that job on all homes in the community in return for the work of others on his own home. All the homes are finished at the same time and all the families move in simultaneously.

The Indianapolis program had its trial and error period and the first house took over 5,600 man-hours and cost \$17,000. Since that time the process has been reduced to 900 man-hours at a cost of \$14,000 or less. This very successful program has completed homes for 331 families with an initial investment of \$200,000 in the 13 years since its inception and has added nearly \$5 million to the city's tax revenue.

But most important is the psychological and social impact on the people and the community. They have developed valuable skills which make home maintenance much more a matter of ease and determination and there is increased fellowship and mutuality of interest in the community.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, June 19, 1964]

HOMEOWNERSHIP PLAN SUGGESTED FOR SLUMS

Homeownership in slum areas should be encouraged as a way of creating middle-class values and responsible community spirit, a social worker said yesterday.

Lawrence Schein, research director of the Community Service Council of Delaware, made the suggestion yesterday at a meeting in the YMCA of the Inter-Agency Planning Committee, made up of representatives of agencies engaged in physical and social planning in the State. He elaborated on his remarks in an interview this morning.

Yesterday's meeting was not held to make decisions or to adopt programs, merely to exchange ideas.

Schein said the Greater Wilmington Development Council might buy up blocks of marginal houses, fix them up and rent them at low-profit margins, giving tenants the option to buy.

He said the Woodlawn Trustees have been renting houses at very low rates and keeping them in good repair for many years. He said he thinks there are hundreds of these in Wilmington.

Schein also suggested a human relations clinic for landlords who persistently violate housing laws. He said housing courts could require attendance at seminars where landlords would be exposed to basic anthropology and what science says about racial differences.

Sociology, the history of minority groups, the role of poverty and the difficult housing

conditions many groups face would also be taught, he said, so landlords could see tenants as human beings and deal with them in ways to get the best cooperation.

The importance of simple observance of the law would also be stressed, he said.

The poor aren't poorer here than anywhere else, Schein said. They just stand out more here against a background of great wealth.

Schein suggested possible reimposition of rent controls and assessment on the basis of profits derived rather than value of the property which discourages improvements.

Some low-cost housing should be built in Poplar Street Project A, Schein said, to make it possible for some Negroes to live there. He said Negroes feel they were deceived when their houses were taken away with no opportunity to move back.

CITIZEN ACTION FOR HOUSING AND RENEWAL

This is the third pamphlet in a series about housing problems for the United Steelworkers of America. Comments and questions may be sent to Roland M. Sawyer, housing consultant, United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh 22, Pa.

Although the boards of housing authorities and urban renewal agencies commonly have a union member or two, most commissioners represent the upper income brackets. They have established a remarkable record for integrity and for civic spirit (no commissioner gets paid).

But when they make decisions affecting thousands of lives, these men and women tend to think in terms of what's good for the town, and many of them are persuaded that what's good for private business is very good for the town.

For example, the largest corporation in one city needed more space. The plant was wedged between a river and a slightly blighted residential section. It happened that an officer of the corporation was chairman of the local redevelopment authority. Result: A five-block area was turned into a \$1,400,000 urban renewal project, and the corporation got the section it needed for about one-fifth of the actual cost. It was a perfectly clean transaction. Both the corporation and the community stood to gain. The only losers were the families who got evicted.

One forthright official of a redevelopment agency made this private comment:

"You get into public service, and after a few years you start acting like it's your own private business. You tend to lean on the advice of advisory committees which think the same way you do. You don't feel obligated to explain a specific project to the people living in the area. Some of these people have been living there for 20 or 30 years or longer. Yet nobody considers it important to tell them exactly why their houses are going to be torn down, and precisely when they should move.

NOT UNLESS THEY ORGANIZE

"Imagine, if you can, an urban renewal agency run by people from blighted areas. So one day a big shot banker reads in the morning paper that his estate has been included in an urban renewal park project. You know what would happen—he would call the mayor and raise hell, and the mayor would say it must have been a mistake and he would personally see to it that the plans were changed. And they would be. Now the janitor's 25-foot lot may be just as important to him as the 10 acres are to the banker, but is the mayor going to listen to Mike Murphy or Jesus Gonzales or any other poor devil from the slums? Not unless they organize and march on city hall."

The building of low-rent housing and the clearance of blighted acres have become new roles of government in the United States. But the old responsibility of government

remains: To heed the petitions of citizens. The responsibility of citizens is to speak out so clearly that every government official can hear them.

The citizens have not always done so. The problem of middle-income housing is a pertinent example. Millions of families have too much income to qualify for low-rent public housing—but not enough to afford good private dwellings. Congress knows this. The Housing and Home Finance Agency knows it. Everybody knows it, especially the real estate industry, which doesn't want the Government to enter the middle-income field. So, for a quarter of a century, Congress has shut its eyes to the need for middle-income housing. A few concessions have been made, but there is still nothing that could be called a real program. And there won't be—until the citizens resolutely demand it.

CITIZENS IN ACTION

Nothing redevelops a governmental bureaucracy more effectively than a rebellion of the citizens.

In New York City, the dictator of urban renewal for many years was Robert Moses. A local saying was "Man proposes, Moses disposes." Block after block of housing was leveled as the bulldozers kept rolling along. Protests were muffled and protestants were muted by the collapsing walls.

One of the choicest sections of Greenwich Village caught Moses' eye. This was an area just south of Washington Square, where old tenements and a few modern apartment houses backed up on a green strip extending for the full length of a long city block. It was like a hidden park. Nearby on MacDougal Street were the coffee houses, shops, and restaurants that have attracted hundreds of thousands of tourists. Moses decided that all of these old-fashioned buildings should be demolished and something more sanitary erected.

FAREWELL TO MOSES

The old structures are still standing, but Moses is no longer redeveloping. What happened was that the people revolted. They didn't know that you can't fight city hall, so they went ahead and fought and won. The urban renewal scheme was junked.

Something entirely different happened in Philadelphia. The redevelopment authority and the planning commission wanted to save a neighborhood that was going downhill fast. There were 1,050 dwellings in the 67-acre Morton project on Germantown Avenue. For decades the neighborhood had been racially integrated, with Italians and Negroes predominating. The Italians had no wish to abandon the fig trees, the grapevines, and the flowers they had tended for years. The Negroes knew there were few good neighborhoods where they would be welcome.

So, instead of leveling the whole area, the redevelopment authority carefully selected the worst structures—about one-fifth of the total. After they were demolished, the housing authority built small clusters of two-story, low-rent dwellings, designed to harmonize with the neighborhood. The existing industries were allowed to remain, since they employed many of the residents.

Louis Sauer, an architect who could see values in old things as well as new ones, was hired by the redevelopment authority to help the residents improve their shabby properties.

"I met with 10 owners at first and asked them what they wanted," he recalls. "We discussed the front of the houses and the backyards. The rear was a mess of junk and trash on a steep upward slope. I had hoped to get rid of the fences dividing the narrow lots and have a clear sweep, but the owners didn't want that. The fences remained. If you ask people to give you a mandate, you have to accept it."

THE PEOPLE ARE STILL THERE

The Morton project isn't finished yet. Blight hasn't been eradicated. But people haven't been eradicated, either. The families who have felt comfortable in the neighborhood for many years are feeling a bit more comfortable today. If there is any better test of the value of urban renewal, the people in Philadelphia haven't heard of it.

All over the Nation today thousands upon thousands of houses are being demolished because an urban renewal agency thinks it would be better to have high-rise and high-rent apartments, or because a highway engineer wants to let more people drive downtown to hunt for parking space. Almost any proposed new use is considered more important than the ancient function of sheltering a family. And so people are evicted to make way for supermarkets and speedways. When citizens organize to assert their equality with automobiles and apartment houses, urban life will become sweeter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCHADEBERG (at the request of Mr. JOHANSEN), for today and the balance of the week, on account of attendance at House Committee on Un-American Activities in Minneapolis.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GRIFFIN (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan), for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. McDOWELL, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. MCINTIRE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 502. An act to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2370. An act authorizing maintenance of flood and arroyo sediment control dams

and related works to facilitate Rio Grande canalization project and authorizing appropriations for that purpose; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 221. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from an injury or disease arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period;

H.R. 6041. An act to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended;

H.R. 9311. An act to continue for 2 years the existing suspensions of duty on certain alumina and bauxite; and

H.R. 9740. An act to establish the Roosevelt Campobello International Park, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1608. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain aircraft engines and propellers may be exported as working parts of aircraft, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2652. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the duty-free importation of certain wools for use in the manufacturing of polishing felts;

H.R. 2726. An act for the relief of John F. Wood, of Newport News, Va.;

H.R. 2818. An act for the relief of Elmer J. and Richard R. Payne;

H.R. 3348. An act to amend section 316 of the social security amendments of 1958 to extend the time within which teachers and other employees covered by the same retirement system in the State of Maine may be treated as being covered by separate retirement systems for purposes of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program;

H.R. 3496. An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1965;

H.R. 4198. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of soluble and instant coffee;

H.R. 6308. An act for the relief of Gerard Puillet;

H.R. 6843. An act for the relief of David Sheppard;

H.R. 7480. An act to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on manganese ore (including ferruginous ore) and related products;

H.R. 8230. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts;

H.R. 8268. An act to prevent double taxation in the case of certain tobacco products exported and returned unchanged to the United States for delivery to a manufacturer's bonded factory;

H.R. 8459. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to allow Federal credit

unions greater flexibility in their organization and operations;

H.R. 8673. An act to amend title V of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the validity of an instrument the recording of which is provided for by such act shall be governed by the laws of the place in which such instrument is delivered, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8964. An act for the relief of Diedre Regina Shore;

H.R. 8975. An act to provide for the tariff classification of certain particleboard;

H.R. 9090. An act for the relief of Mrs. Audrey Rossmann;

H.R. 9220. An act for the relief of Elisabete Maria Fonseca;

H.R. 9688. An act to extend the period during which responsibility for the placement and foster care of dependent children, under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, may be exercised by a public agency other than the agency administering such aid under the State plan;

H.R. 9720. An act authorizing a study of dust control measures at Long Island, Port Isabel, Tex.;

H.R. 9934. An act to authorize the construction of a dam on the St. Louis River, Minn.;

H.R. 9964. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H.R. 10463. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1965, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 10465. An act to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders;

H.R. 10466. An act to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to extend the period during which temporary assistance may be provided for U.S. citizens returned from foreign countries;

H.R. 10468. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1966, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes;

H.R. 10537. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain natural graphite; and

H.R. 10945. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes, p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 25, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2210. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the fifth annual report on user charges instituted and maintained by the agencies of the executive branch for the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2211. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a

report on a review relating to deficiencies in maintenance and supply support of U.S. Army helicopters in South Vietnam disclosed that more than 40 percent of the helicopters assigned to the U.S. Army Support Group in Vietnam had been consistently unavailable for service because of inadequate maintenance capability and shortages of spare parts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2212. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, relative to submitting a report relating to House Resolution 774, 87th Congress, dated September 17, 1962. The return of these papers without action by the court has been found necessary as a result of the Supreme Court's decision in *Glidden Co. v. Zdanok* (370 U.S. 530), decided June 25, 1962; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2213. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States; transmitting a report on a review relating to the cancellation and curtailment of specialized rotary wing pilot training courses because helicopters were grounded for lack of serviceable engines, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2214. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review of excessive disability pension payments resulting from inadequate procedures for review of annual income questionnaires, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2215. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1964 (77 Stat. 141, 143); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

2216. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the Report of the Proceedings of a Special Meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., March 16-17, 1964, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 331 (H. Doc. No. 312); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 7807. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954 with respect to the apportionment of the depletion allowance between parties to contracts for the extraction of minerals or the severance of timber; with amendment (Rept. No. 1516). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 11707. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner General for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 11708. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner General for

U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 11709. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner General for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 11710. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner General for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 11711. A bill to repeal paragraph (6) of section 4231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to amend section 4232 of such code relating to definitions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 11712. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 11713. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide that button blanks, regardless of state of finish, shall be subject to the same duty as buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 11714. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act to make that act applicable to cigarettes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11715. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 6-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 11716. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes to make all restrictions on branching by State banks imposed by the law of any State equally applicable to national banks located within such State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11717. A bill to provide for public hearings in connection with the chartering of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 11718. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the non-military capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 11719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income certain retroactively awarded disability compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 11720. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 20-percent credit against the individual income tax for certain educational expenses incurred at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 11721. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner General for

U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11722. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase benefits, to provide full retirement benefits for men at age 62 and women at age 60, to provide widows' benefits without regard to age in cases of disability, and to remove the limitation on the amount of outside earnings permitted while receiving benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 11723. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner General for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 11724. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify the treatment of ball or roller bearings and parts thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITENER (by request):

H.R. 11725. A bill to amend an act concerning gifts of securities to minors in the District of Columbia to permit savings and loan associations to act as custodians of gifts to minors; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 11726. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner General for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCLORY:

H.R. 11727. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1899, to authorize the United States to recover by civil actions the cost of removing certain obstructions from the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 11728. A bill to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 1052. Joint resolution authorizing the First Cavalry Division Association to erect a monument in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.J. Res. 1053. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that Representatives in Congress shall be apportioned among the several States every 10 years according to their respective numbers of persons registered to vote in national elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1054. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 722 of the 79th Congress, and Public Law 85-935, relating to the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCCULLOUGH:

H.J. Res. 1055. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H. Con. Res. 316. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the imposition of appropriate sanctions by the United Nations against those member states whose governments engage in certain discriminatory practices in viola-

tion of article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 11729. A bill for the relief of Woo Foon Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 11730. A bill for the relief of Roland Poirier, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11731. A bill for the relief of Michele Granaudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11732. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harris Crogh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 11733. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11734. A bill for the relief of Paul Leopold Hofmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11735. A bill for the relief of Shirley Shapiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 11736. A bill to provide for the advancement of Hospitalman Chief Gerald Henry White, U.S. Navy (retired), to the grade of chief warrant pharmacist; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 11737. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wanda Zybaczinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 11738. A bill for the relief of Saleh Zen and his wife, Saripah Salmiah Zen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11739. A bill for the relief of Nachman Erlichman and his wife, Michal Erlichman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 11740. A bill for the relief of Jack Ralph Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

945. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to pass a law providing for public attorneys who will aid citizens in their legal problems, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Akron Supports the U.S. Olympic Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1964

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, this October the athletes of the entire world will gather in Japan to compete in the Olympic games. The U.S. Olympic Committee is now gathering funds to send the participants that will represent this Nation to those games.

The 14th District of Ohio has always been in the forefront in Olympic activities. This year, under the encouragement of the Akron Beacon Journal and the Akron Chamber of Commerce, the schoolchildren decided to become partners in this venture. Nearly 8,000 children contributed to this fund.

At a recent Olympic Day dinner in Akron, they presented a telegram that bore the names of all of them. It is my understanding that this was the longest telegram ever sent. It was addressed, as a note of encouragement to those Akron area athletes who will actively participate in the 1964 Olympics.

One of the greatest basketball teams of modern times is located in Akron, Ohio. I am speaking of the team that this year won the national AAU championship—the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. team. Three members of this team have been chosen as members of the 12-man U.S. Olympic basketball team. Those great athletes are Larry Brown, Dick Davies, and Pete McCaffrey. I would add that Goodyear coach Hank Vaughn, together with Oklahoma Coach Hank Iba, will guide our representatives in the 16-team competition.

The 14th Congressional District, in the past, has had many medal winners in the Olympic games. I know that the Members of the House will remember the illustrious records of Hayes Alan Jenkins, Carol Heiss, Les Carney, Pete Rademacher, Jim George, Keith Carter, Betty

Jean Maycock, Karen Oldham, Joe Kotys, Janet Bachna, Glenn Davis, David Jenkins, Pete George, Jimmy McClain, and the late Jack Taylor. All of these brought honor to our Nation.

I feel certain that this October, we will be able to add the names of Larry Brown, Dick Davies, and Pete McCaffrey to this long list of Olympic medal winners.

The Akron Olympic Day dinner raised many thousands of dollars to help defray the expenses of the Olympic team.

I wish to commend the Olympic Day committee for its efforts. That committee headed by George Brittain, executive vice president of the Akron Chamber of Commerce, consisted of Lincoln Hackim, of Norman Malone Associates; Chuck Bloedorn, of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.; Jack Patterson and William Schlemmer, of the Akron Beacon Journal; Bob Wilson, of radio station WADC; and Bob Wylie of radio station WAKR.

Truly the spirit of these men and of the schoolchildren should inspire all of us to lend our support to the U.S. Olympic Committee.

Crime in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, a young lady was a victim of assassination near Times Square, in the heart of New York City. Miss Joan Wilson was brutally murdered by a sniper's bullet, apparently for no reason other than the fact that she was there.

Mr. Speaker, certain Members of Congress representing that beleaguered city derive their political subsistence from continuing demagogic harangues of hatred directed against the people of Mississippi. Their chief stock in trade is in maligning the people of the South while sweeping their own dirt under the rug.

Mr. Speaker, New York City is one of the most crime-infested areas in the country, and its crime rate makes that of Mississippi look like a Sunday School picnic by comparison.

Mr. Speaker, if these Members are so deeply concerned about law, order, and civil peace, they would devote their energies and such talents as they may have in the protection of their own people, rather than encouraging and fomenting racial incidents in the South.

Tribute to Jester Hairston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1964

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, in the great State of California, and city of Los Angeles, resides a noted and talented American. Most TV viewers or radio listeners know him as LeRoy, the brother of Sapphire, and the tyrant of Kingfish. However, I feel that his contribution to the American society and the entertainment world has been much more influential and forceful.

This famed American and outstanding Californian is the inimitable Jester Hairston. Mr. Hairston studied music at Tufts University, where he received his degree in music, and did further study at the Julliard Conservatory. Shortly afterward, Mr. Hairston began composing and arranging choral music for the Hall Johnson Choir. His talent in this field was quickly recognized and he eventually moved up to assistant conductor of the choir.

He served with the choir for 15 dedicated years. During those 15 years, he conducted and arranged choral music for radio and Broadway musical shows. He worked with such outstanding artists as the late Al Jolson, Andre Kostelantz, Alfred Wallenstein—former conductor of the Los Angeles Symphony—and Fred Waring.